Proving Woman

VISIT...

PROVING WOMAN

Female Spirituality and Inquisitional Culture in the Later Middle Ages

DYAN ELLIOTT

PROVING WOMAN

Female Spirituality and Inquisitional Culture in the Later Middle Ages

DYAN ELLIOTT

Proving Woman

Proving Woman

FEMALE SPIRITUALITY AND INQUISITIONAL CULTURE IN THE LATER MIDDLE AGES

Dyan Elliott

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
PRINCETON AND OXFORD

Copyright ©2004 by Princeton University Press
Published by Princeton University Press, 41 William Street,
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

In the United Kingdom: Princeton University Press, 3 Market Place,
Woodstock, Oxfordshire OX20 1SY

All Rights Reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data Elliott, Dyan, 1954–
Proving woman : female spirituality and inquisitional culture in the later Middle Ages / Dyan Elliott.
p.cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
eISBN: 978-1-40082-602-5
1. Women—Religious life—History. 2. Church history—Middle Ages, 600–1500.
3. Mysticism—History—Middle Ages, 600–1500. 4. Women mystics—Europe.
5. Heresy—History—To 1500. 6. Inquisition. I. Title.

BR163.E55 2004
270.5'082—dc222003053680

British Library Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available

This book has been composed in Sabon
Printed on acid-free paper. ∞
pup.princeton.edu
Printed in the United States of America
1 3 5 7 9 1 0 8 6 4 2

For Gail Vanstone

proven friend, whose friendship has meant so much

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments
Abbreviations
Introduction
CHAPTER ONE Sacramental Confession as Proof of Orthodoxy
PART ONE Women as Proof of Orthodoxy
CHAPTER TWO The Beguines: A Sponsored Emergence
CHAPTER THREE Elisabeth of Hungary: Between Men
PART TWO Inquisitions and Proof
CHAPTER FOUR Sanctity, Heresy, and Inquisition
CHAPTER FIVE Between Two Deaths: The Living Mystic
PART THREE The Discernment of Spirits
CHAPTER SIX Clerical Quibbles
CHAPTER SEVEN John Gerson and Joan of Arc
CONCLUSION
Bibliography

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

MANY DEBTS of gratitude were incurred during the writing of this book. I have been the fortunate beneficiary of considerable institutional support. At the top of the list is the ongoing generosity and encouragement that I have received from my home institution, Indiana University, and the Department of History, in particular. I would especially like to thank the chair of my department, John Bodnar, for his support. I have also been blessed with the opportunity to work in some lovely, even enchanted, places, for which I am forever grateful. In the academic year of 1996–97, I was the recipient of an ACLS (American Council of Learned Societies) fellowship while a member of the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study. The following year, I was a fellow at the National Humanities Center in the Research Triangle, North Carolina. In the spring of 2002, I was the Visiting Meaker Professor of Medieval Studies at the University of Bristol and then a fellow at the Rockefeller Foundation's beautiful Villa Serbelloni in Bellagio, Italy. Many thanks to my fellow residents and colleagues for the stimulation and pleasure they provided in these remarkable venues. I have particularly benefited from the wisdom, humor, and friendship of Fernando Cervantes (whom I first met at Princeton and would joyfully reencounter at the University of Bristol); Peter Jelavich and Judy Klein (from the National Humanities Center); and Carolyn Muessig and Elizabeth Archibald (University of Bristol). I would also like to thank the wonderful members of my postgraduate seminar in Bristol on gender and popular religion, who taught me all about learned pub nights—a sadly neglected discipline in North America.

Thanks to Peter Jelavich, who helped me with some German translations and stoically read and commented on the entire manuscript; to Paul Strohm, who read and commented on several chapters; and to the anonymous readers of Princeton University Press, who I have since learned to my own (and the manuscript's) good fortune were Penelope Johnson and Barbara Newman. I am additionally appreciative for the support of my editor, Brigitta van Rheinberg, and of Lauren Lepow—manuscript editor extraordinaire! Working with Brigitta was a new pleasure. But I had worked with Lauren earlier with such happy results that I would spend months scheming over how I could ensure being assigned to her again. As before, the experience has been deeply gratifying.

Chapter 4 incorporates sections of my articles "*Dominae* or *Dominatae*? Female Mystics and the Trauma of Textuality" (in *Women, Marriage, and Family in Medieval Christendom: Essays in Memory of Michael M. Sheehan, C.S.B.*, ed. Constance Rousseau and Joel

Rosenthal [Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, 1998], pp. 47–77); “The Physiology of Rapture and Female Spirituality” (in *Medieval Theology and the Natural Body*, ed. Peter Biller and Alastair Minnis [Wood-bridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell and Brewer, 1997], pp. 141–73); and“Women and Confession: From Empowerment to Pathology” (in *Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages*, ed. Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski [Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2003], pp. 31–51). The lion’s share of chapter 7 is a condensed version of “Seeing Double: John Gerson, the Discernment of Spirits, and Joan of Arc” (*American Historical Review* 107 [2002]: 26–54). I would like to thank the respective presses for the right to make use of this material.

I cannot imagine writing this book without the unstinting and loving support of certain other friends, who were always there during the trying times when my focus mysteriously shifted from *Proving Woman* to “Proving Dyan.” David Brakke, Dori Elliott, Mary Favret, Susan Gubar, Don Gray, Wendy Harris, Pat Phillips, Carol Ribner, and Mary Jo Weaver all deserve my heartfelt thanks. But I particularly wish to acknowledge my enduring indebtedness to Gail Vanstone, to whom this book is dedicated.

ABBREVIATIONS

AA SS	*Acta Sanctorum*. Paris: Victor Palmé, 1865–.
AB	*Analecta Bollandiana*. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1882–.
AFH	*Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*. Fathers of the College of St. Bonaventure. Florence: College of Saint Bonaventure, 1908–.
AFP	*Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*. Rome: Institutum historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum ad S. Sabinae, 1930–.
Auvray	*Les Registres de Grégoire IX*. Ed. Lucien Auvray. 4 vols. Paris: Albert Fontemoing, 1896–1955.
Aveu	*L'Aveu: Antiquité et Moyen-Age*. Actes de la table ronde organisée par l'École française de Rome avec le concours du CNRS et de l'Université de Trieste, Rome 28–30 mars 1984. Rome: Ecole française de Rome, Palais Farnèse, 1986.
BS	*Bibliotheca Sanctorum*. 12 vols. and index. Rome: Città nuova editrice, 1961–70.
CCCM	*Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaeualis*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1966–.
CCSL	*Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1953–.
CSEL	*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. Vienna: F. Tempsky [et al.], 1866–.
De apibus	Thomas of Cantimpré. *Bonum universale de apibus*. Douai: B. Belleri, 1627.
Denifle	Denifle, Heinrich, ed. *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*. 4 vols. Paris: Fratres Delalain, 1889–97.
DS	*Dictionnaire de spiritualité*. Under the direction of Marcel Viller et al. 16 vols. Paris: Beauchesne, 1937–95.
EETS	*Early English Text Society*. London: Trübner [et al.], 1864–.
Faire Croire	*Faire Croire: Modalités de la diffusion et de la réception des messages religieux du XIIe au XVe siècle*. Table ronde organisée par l'Ecole française de Rome, en collaboration avec l'Institut d'histoire médiévale de

l'Université de Padoue, Rome, 22–23 juin 1979. Rome: Ecole française de Rome, Palais Farnèse, 1981.

FC — *Fathers of the Church*. New York: Cima, Fathers of the Church [et al.], 1947–.

Gerson, *Oeuvres* — *Oeuvres complètes*. Ed. Palémon Glorieux. 10 vols. Paris: Desclée, 1960–73.

Glossa ordinaria — *Textus Biblie cum glosa ordinaria, Nicolai de Lyra postilla, moralitatibus eiusdem*. 6 vols in 5. Basel: Johannes Petri et Johannes Frobenius, 1506–8.

Lea, *Confession* — Lea, H. C. *A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*. 3 vols. London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1896.

Lea, *Inquisition* — Lea, Henry Charles. *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*. 3 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1906.

LNPNF — *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Church*. New York: Christian Literature Co. [et al.], 1887–92; reprint, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans [et al.], 1952–.

Mansi — Mansi, G. D., ed. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*. 53 vols. in 60. Paris: H. Welter, 1901–27.

MEFRM — *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Moyen Age–Temps Modernes*.

MGH — *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. Hanover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani [et al.], 1826–.

MGH SS — *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*.

PG — *Patrologiae cursus completus . . . series Graeca*. Ed. J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1857–66.

PL — *Patrologiae cursus completus . . . series Latina*. Ed. J.-P. Migne. 221 vols. Paris: Garnier Fratres and J.-P. Migne, 1844–64.

Raymundiana — Balmé, Francis, and Celsus Paban, eds. *Raymundiana*. Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum Historica, VI, 1–2. Rome: In Domo Generalitia; Stuttgart: J. Roth, 1898, 1901.

RIS — *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*. Ed. L. A. Muratori. Rev. ed. 34 vols. Città di Castello: S. Lapi, 1900–1917.

SC — *Sources chrétiennes*. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1940–.

ST — Thomas Aquinas. *Summa theologiae*. 61 vols. London: Blackfriars, in conjunction with Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1964–81.

SVMO — Thomas of Cantimpré. *Supplementum ad Vitam S. Mariae Oigniacensis*, *AA SS*, June, 5:572–81. Trans.

Margot King. *Supplement to the Life of Marie d'Oignies*. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Peregrina, 1987.

Tanner — *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*. Ed. Norman Tanner. 2 vols. London: Sheed and Ward; Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1990.

VCM — Thomas of Cantimpré. *Vita Christinae Mirabilis*, *AA SS*, July, 5:637–60. Trans. Margot King. *The Life of Christina of Saint Trond*. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Peregrina, 1986.

VLA — Thomas of Cantimpré, *Vita Lutgardis*, *AA SS*, June, 6:187–209. Trans. Margot King. *The Life of Lutgard of Aywières*. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Peregrina, 1987.

VMO — James of Vitry. *Vita B. Mariae Oigniacensis*, *AA SS*, June, 5:547–72. Trans. Margot King. *The Life of Marie d'Oignies*. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Peregrina Publishing, 1986.

VMY — Thomas of Cantimpré. *Vita Margarete de Ypris*. Ed. G. Meersseman. Appendix of "Les frères prêcheurs et le mouvement dévot en Flandre au XIIIe siècles." *AFP* 18 (1948): 106–30. Trans. Margot King. *The Life of Margaret of Ypres*. Toronto: Peregrina, 1999.

WE — Wakefield, Walter, and Austin Evans, eds. *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.

Proving Woman

Introduction

THIS BOOK addresses the trajectory of female spirituality over the course of the High and later Middle Ages. From a certain perspective, it is a familiar story to which all students of the medieval and early modern periods can supply the ending: during this period, female spirituality ("always already" suspect) is progressively perceived as a substantial threat to the church and society at large. This gradual criminalization of female spirituality parallels the progressive efforts to constrain and even persecute women, an impetus most dramatically illustrated in the witch-hunts of the early modern period. Therefore this book is not really about what happens to female spirituality, but about why it happens. It attempts to isolate a constellation of factors that help to explain this process.

At the very center of this problem are the various convulsions medieval society was undergoing around the time of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215). As papal antidote to contemporary confusion, Lateran IV is undoubtedly the clearest statement we have of the problems confronting the medieval church in this period as viewed through the lens of the higher clergy. Although the problems are legion, there are several strands that are of particular importance to this study: the threat of heresy; the regulation of sanctity; the new emphasis on the sacraments, particularly confession and the eucharist; and the introduction of the inquisitional procedure. From the perspective of the church hierarchy's disciplinary measures, these three strands are strategically interwoven in the fight against heresy: heretical antisacramentalism is countered by a due reverence for the sacraments, which becomes one of the benchmarks of orthodoxy; saints are newly perceived as key players in the struggle against heresy—hence an emphasis on the sacraments becomes intrinsic to con-temporary profiles of sanctity; the inquisitional procedure will soon be adopted as the instrument for assessing both sanctity and heresy; and the sacrament of confession, made mandatory for the first time at the council, emerges as a new proof of orthodoxy, obliquely corresponding to the emphasis placed on confession in inquisitional procedure. All of these considerations are implicated in the way in which female spirituality is portrayed in this period.

Lateran IV also both signals and abets a more abstract change that affected individuals in all walks of life: a growing concern with what constitutes proof. The outlawing of the ordeal and the introduction of the inquisitional process are certainly the most explicit conciliar articulations of this change, but the deliberations of the council are everywhere riddled with similar problems of evidence. Undoubtedly

the most pressing of these issues is what constitutes orthodoxy or heresy. Papal efforts to control the identification of saints or the public veneration of relics are like-wise freighted with considerations of proving authenticity. Many of these proof-fraught questions remain unanswered, but others would eventually find resolution through recourse to the inquisitional process, a disciplinary measure promoted by this council in response to the problem of how to proceed against a cleric accused of a crime. Very soon, a wide set of ecclesiastical and secular tribunals will look increasingly to the inquisition as the primary mechanism for the production of truth. Therefore through-out this study, the term "inquisition" (*inquisitio*), even when applied to a particular tribunal, should be understood in the widest sense as a procedure not limited to one forum but the province of many. In all cases, the term is more reflective of a process than of an institution—a point that needs constant reiterating particularly with respect to heresy.[1]

Contemporary representations of female sanctity were in many ways sculpted to confound the heretic. Central features of women's spirituality that first emerged during this period—its physicality, eucharistic devotion, confessional practice—all answer to this need, providing vivid proof of orthodox contentions. This study examines what the phenomenon of women as proof of orthodoxy means: how female spiritual claims were first established, subsequently wielded, and then ultimately discredited. Both the supporters and the detractors of holy women looked progressively to more or less formal versions of the inquisitional procedure in order to prove (or disprove) the authenticity of women's spiritual lives. One of my arguments is that the continued application of this procedure progressively undermined clerical perceptions of the essential integrity of female spirituality, whatever the original motive dictating the adoption of this procedure. Ultimately, the procedure itself contributes substantially to the faltering profile of female spirituality to the extent that, by the end of the fourteenth century, women will no longer be perceived primarily as proving orthodoxy's dogmatic contentions—contentions that have, by now, been satisfactorily sustained in any event. Instead, women's faith and religious practices will be increasingly scrutinized from a skeptical standpoint, and the women themselves will ultimately be required to prove their own orthodoxy. Moreover, female sanctity is not a discrete phenomenon, cordoned off from its larger spiritual setting. The common application of the inquisitional process for the purpose of establishing the veracity of both sanctity and heresy tended to narrow the gap between these two conditions generally. The holy woman's downward spiraling can again be perceived as both symptom of and stimulant for this gradual

dissolution of coherent categories. But like Lucifer, she did not fall alone. Even as the rebellious angel took a good chunk of the heavenly host along with him, the female saint also dragged positive representations of sanctity along in her wake.

Thus far I have been using the word "proof" in a legalistic or academic sense: to prove a case; to prove a position—both of which activities are accommodated by the Latin verb *probare*. But the same word had other dimensions as well. God proves his saints as gold in the fire, which in this context would be best understood in the sense of "tests" or "tempts." This manner of proving functions as a way of manifesting both to God (whose omniscience does not really require this information) and especially to humankind that the person in question is, indeed, a saint. Such testing, however, was not restricted to the perfected individual; it could also serve a purgative function for the sinner. Thus God proves the sinner through the infliction of suffering to purge an individual of sins for his or her own good. The expiational effect of purgatorial fire is but one aspect of this sometimes bewildering side of divine clemency. Although the agents for inflicting such persecution had traditionally been associated with the devil, the celebration of suffering in the High Middle Ages will interfere with the devil's near monopoly over the administration of such travails. The rising appreciation of the value of suffering alters the traditional perception of the agents responsible for its infliction, tending to purify, justify, and sometimes even sanctify the punitive function of both church and state. We hear an echo of this process in Chaucer's hagiographically inflected *Clerk's Tale* and its justification of the coercive aspects of gender roles dictated by the institution of marriage. The virtuous wife, Griselda, who is likened both to Job and to gold in the fire, demonstrates her submission to God's will through submission to her husband's authority—even when such submission requires the sacrifice of her children. The concept of proving is possessed of still darker aspects: *probare* is also a verb used for torture —a possibility that is at the center of the martyr's *passio* but that invariably hovers at the edge of the heretical trial. In other words, I am seeking to encounter proof in its many different guises, and the ways in which these meanings reverberate in the religious lives of medieval women and society at large.

This study arose out of the sense that the categories of saint and heretic have too often been treated in isolation, or at least oppositionally—a dualistic perspective that in many ways reflects ecclesiastical hopes. There are some studies that represent exceptions to this kind of compartmentalization: scholars such as Peter Dinzelbacher, Richard Kieckhefer, and Aviad Kleinberg have all pointed to a number of disputed cases of sanctity, or circumstances

under which the distinction between saint and heretic breaks down altogether.[2] Similarly, Barbara Newman has treated orthodox and heretical mystical writings as indivisible aspects of a coherent corpus.[3] The present work likewise seeks to challenge the boundaries be-tween sanctity and heresy: first, by analyzing their symbiotic natures, and second, by examining procedure with a view to understanding unintended effects. As suggested earlier, the very mechanisms developed for discerning the saint and the heretic inevitably make these categories more proximate. In order to trace this progressive development, I have cast my net as widely as possible, enlisting sources that reflect each of these imagined polarities: hagiographies, processes of canonization, heretical trials, manuals for both confessors and inquisitors of heresy, theological and canonical writings, ritual protocol, chronicles, and exempla are among the sources consulted to shed light on how the purity of an individual's spiritual metal is tested or "proved."

The sacrament of confession is at the very heart of representations of female spirituality in this period, and the far-reaching implications of this emphasis constitute one of the major themes of this book. Thus chapter 1 examines the concurrent rise of sacramental confession and its inquisitional counterpart with a view to illuminating how this parallel fostered what I refer to as a "covert bridge" between the respective tribunals. The two chapters comprised by part 1 focus on the way in which the female spirituality emerging in the wake of Lateran IV was shaped within the confessional relationship and then deployed in the fight against heresy. Chapter 2 analyzes the antiheretical impetus of the Beguines' confessional practices: their profound veneration for their confessors, their scrupulosity, their visions of purgatory, and their extreme asceticism. Taken together, these features function as a profound endorsement not only of auricular confession but of the entire penitential framework on which the sacrament depends. The example of Elisabeth of Hungary, the focus of chapter 3, reveals a different aspect of the church's antiheretical initiative. Both during her lifetime and after her death, Elisabeth was in the hands of the chief architects of the inquisition against heresy: Gregory IX; his penitentiary, the canon lawyer Raymond of Peñafort; and especially her confessor, Conrad of Marburg, who happened to be the first papal inquisitor. As with the Beguine movement, Elisabeth's unquestioning obedience to her confessor becomes an exemplar used to combat heresy. But the methods employed by her confessor are an early symptom of the heretical tribunal's possible infestation of its sacramental counterpart.

Part 2 explores various deployments of inquisitional procedure with a view to understanding how it impinges on the assessment of an

individual's spiritual profile. The fourth chapter begins with a detailed examination of the protocol followed in two kinds of papal inquisitions: the process against heretics and the canonization of saints. The use of the *inquisitio* in both instances enhances the permeability between for a alluded to above. But the application of this procedure also demonstrates the limitations of clerical control: the chapter concludes with instances from heretical trials or failed canonizations that demonstrate the *inquisitio*'s potential for reversal and other unintended consequences. The fifth chapter concerns individuals who are regarded as holy during their life-time and the ways in which their claims to sanctity are proved, largely by somatic evidence. Such proof can, however, be falsified, as a number of instances of imposture clearly demonstrate. The chapter concludes with the rising tide of medical discourse and its tendency to pathologize, and thus discredit, the most celebrated features of female spirituality.

Part 3 addresses the rise of the discourse of spiritual discernment in the schools. Clerical culture is the focus of chapter 6. By beginning with a demonstration of the parallels between the scholastic methodology and the inquisitional process, and the inherent reversibility of the verdicts arrived at by each, the chapter points to the ultimate instability of any given position. It then turns to certain Ockhamite-inflected questions raised in university circles, which have the effect of casting doubt on mystical experiences. Such clerical apprehension is a contributing factor to the rise of the discourse of spiritual discernment, which, in response to the rise of some highly visible contemporary prophets and visionaries, was intended to assess the validity of their experiences. Chapter 7 examines how theologian and chancellor of the University of Paris John Gerson deployed the discourse of spiritual discernment in order to discredit female mystics —an endeavor associated with his larger strategy of appropriating mysticism to reform the university. His subsequent failed attempt to defend Joan of Arc will ironically testify to the success of his antiwoman initiatives. Gerson's efforts were enthusiastically embraced and extended by subsequent scholars, hence placing a seal on the declining fortunes of female spirituality. Ultimately, the distance between saint and heretic practically disappeared. The church had always been prepared for this eventuality. Christ himself had long ago cautioned against the false Christs and false prophets that would arise toward the end of time (Matt. 24.23–24). The later Middle Ages believed, perhaps with good reason, that this dire time was finally at hand.

There are certain tendencies implicit in this study that may, I fear, exasperate individual readers. First, I am concerned with how the

religious identity of an individual is established—be that person a saint, a heretic, or just an undifferentiated member of the faithful. This orientation periodically requires a close examination of what might be considered aspects of the clerical culture of work: confessors' manuals, ecclesiastical procedure, ritual, scholarly convention, and theological controversy—masculine discourses, sometimes peppered by case studies that, if they address questions of gender at all, usually do so only obliquely. But these various facets are essential to an understanding of the environment in which female spirituality develops, is apprehended, and is assessed. A reader may further experience frustration with my approach to the women discussed, contending that I never really touch base with their spiritual lives. From this perspective, the presence of "female spirituality" in the title of this study may be perceived as highly misleading. In a certain sense, I would have to agree: this study both is and is not a book about female spirituality. It *is* insofar as it isolates factors that played an important role in how female spirituality was presented and how these representations were used. Moreover, it points to the propitious conditions under which female spirituality first flourished as well as the prohibitive ones that sought (often unsuccessfully) its suppression. But this study is *not* about female spirituality in terms of analyzing what the women in question really believed or experienced, even if, occasionally, such questions are addressed. In short, I am seeking to examine an important component of what might be described as the "frame" for female spirituality; I am not nearly as concerned with the picture within that frame except from the rarefied perspective of why the picture assumed the appearance it did, and how certain parties within the clergy may have sought to capitalize on it.

This is not to say that female spirituality is framed by inhibiting factors alone. Nor do I think that every feature of this frame is as repressive and potentially punitive as are the components I am isolating. Some readers may regard my focus as negative, even depressing—a characterization I would, again, not entirely contest. In general, this is not a story of transcendence. Although there are a number of striking instances of individuals resisting coercive powers, it is largely a story of constraint, where individuals are often complicit with their constraining forces. Some may think this perspective is unnecessarily pessimistic; but here, I would have to disagree. In the wake of Caroline Walker Bynum's landmark study *Holy Feast and Holy Fast*, a number of works have appeared that celebrate the rich meaning of medieval women's spiritual lives.[4] The areas that I am examining form part of the background against which this more promising narrative of female spiritual transcendence may emerge. An unset jewel gives little indication of the ring as a whole; so it is when

only the positive, volitional aspects of female spirituality are considered.

My emphasis on the clerical role in the construction of sanctity and heresy should not be construed as meaning that female spirituality was invented by a handful of clerical masterminds. Certainly the clergy was largely responsible for the rules with which women possessed of pronounced spiritual inclinations either conformed or contended. When viewed optimistically, rules in general can be construed as the very conditions for most kinds of creativity, even as the sonnet or the fugue is inseparable from the intractable dictates governing their respective forms. More-over, in life as in art, a different, but no less puissant, order of creativity is unleashed when rules are deliberately broken. Either way, censorship itself is capable of generating a certain kind of creative expression—whether its strictures meet with compliance or defiance. But the main disadvantage of our particular rule-bound landscape is that we can seldom discern the extent of the women's participation in what is generally understood to be their own creative performances since the clerical hand constructs or at least shapes the vehicle through which women's creativity is conveyed. Thus the female spirituality to which the historian is privy may be regarded as something of a command performance with mandatory collaboration with a cleric as a given. The performance itself may be alternately amplified and muffled by the powerful clerical collaborator. Either alternative is possible. But it is impossible to know the extent of his intervention since a tacit condition of the performance is that it occur behind a screen. It is often virtually impossible to know who is performing at any given time—the priest or his penitent. Thus if the utopian expectation of identifying an unmediated female voice must ultimately be abandoned, this is not to deny the existence of a female spirituality, one that was meaningful and fulfilling to its female practitioners. This recognition and acceptance of women's veiled performance is alternately exhilarating and debilitating—every bit as full and as empty as Abelard's graceful resolution to the problem of Universals: "that the name of the rose is meaningful to the understanding although there are now no roses remaining . . . otherwise the proposition 'there are no more roses' would not be possible." 5 There are no more roses—no more unmediated spirituality for us to apprehend; but there *were* roses, and this compromise formation means everything to the historian.

Yet supposing we hypothesize an ideal world where each medieval woman was literate and self-determining, free to enjoy and express her spirituality as she saw fit. Even if this were the case, her voice, like any sound, cannot exist in a vacuum. This study attempts to

describe the atmosphere that enables and constrains, but ultimately conveys female speech.

[1] Cf. Henry Ansgar Kelly's objection to the tendency to approach inquisition as a method reserved for heresy alone, rather than recognizing it as a widespread procedure put to many different uses, in "Inquisition and the Prosecution of Heresy: Misconceptions and Abuses," *Church History* 58 (1989): 439–51. Also see Richard Kieckhefer's reminder that the prosecution of heresy itself was discussed in terms of the officers, *inquisitores hereticae pravitatis*, as opposed to an institution known as the "inquisition," which develops only in the early modern period ("The Office of the Inquisition and Medieval Heresy: The Transition from Personal to Institutional Jurisdiction," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46 [1995]: 36–61). Kieckhefer's point is well taken. However, I am convinced that a common ideology—fostered by papal sanctions, inquisitorial manuals, and even the sharing of inquisitional records in order to track a person's guilt—represents an enterprise sufficiently coherent and united to warrant the name "inquisition." Cf. Edward Peters's similar assessment in *Inquisition* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), pp. 67–68.

[2] Peter Dinzelbacher, *Heilige oder Hexen? Schicksale auffälliger Frauen in Mittelalter und Frühneuzeit* (Munich: Artemis and Winkler, 1995); Richard Kieckhefer, "The Holy and the Unholy: Sainthood, Witchcraft, and Magic in Late Medieval Europe," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 24 (1994): 335–85; Aviad Kleinberg, "Proving Sanctity: Selection and Authentication of Saints in the Later Middle Ages," *Viator* 20 (1989): 183–205.

[3] Barbara Newman, "*La mystique courtoise*: Thirteenth-Century Beguines and Religious Women," in *From Virile Woman to WomanChrist: Studies in Medieval Religion and Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995), pp. 137–67.

[4] Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987); eadem, *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (New York: Zone Books, 1991). Among these later studies are: John Coakley, "Gender and the Authority of Friars: The Significance of Holy Women for Thirteenth-Century Franciscans and Dominicans," *Church History* 60 (1991): 445–60; Karma Lochrie, *Margery Kempe and Translations of the Flesh* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991); Dyan Elliott, *Spiritual Marriage: Sexual Abstinence in Medieval Wedlock* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993); Elizabeth Petroff, *Body and Soul: Essays on Medieval Women and Mysticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Amy Hollywood, *The Soul as Virgin Wife: Mechtild of Magdeburg, Marguerite Porete, and Meister Eckhart* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995); Barbara Newman, *From Virile Woman*; eadem, "Possessed by the Spirit: Devout Women, Demoniacs, and the Apostolic Life in the Thirteenth Century," *Speculum* 73 (1998): 733–70. There are also a number of valuable collections that foreground female spirituality. See particularly Catherine Mooney, ed., *Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and Their Interpreters* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999); Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Timea Szell, eds., *Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991)—especially the contributions by John Coakley and Jo Ann McNamara. Cf. the new perspectives offered in Juliette Dor et. al., eds., *New Trends in Feminine Spirituality: The Holy Women of Li[egave]ge and Their Impact* (Brussels: Brepols, 1999).

[5] ". . . ut rosae nomen [non] iam permanentibus rosis, quod tamen tunc

quoque ex intellectu significativum est . . . alioquin propositio non esset: nulla est rosa," Abelard (d. 1142), "Incipiunt glossae secundum magistrum Petrum Abaelardum super Porphyrium," *Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters* 21 (1933): 30. Unless otherwise indicated, translations are mine.

Chapter One

Sacramental Confession as Proof of Orthodoxy

> Oral confession to a priest, introduced by Innocent [III],
>
> is not as necessary to people as he claimed. For if anyone
>
> offends his brother in thought, word or deed, then it suffices to repent in thought, word or deed alone.
>
> It is a grave and unsupported practice for a priest
>
> to hear the confessions of the people in the ways
>
> in which the Latins use.
>
> For [the devil] introduced private confession,
>
> which cannot be justified
>
> (Condemned doctrines attributed to John Wyclif by the
>
> Council of Constance, 1415)[1]

THESE TENETS attributed to English theologian John Wyclif (d. 1384) were condemned at the Council of Constance—the same council at which Wyclif's Bohemian follower, Hus, was arraigned and burned. Nevertheless, they voice an uncomfortable truth: that auricular confession was first mandated for the entire church by Innocent III at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. Moreover, irreverent reflections on this decree were by no means unprecedented. Heretical groups, such as the Waldensians, had long maintained that confession of sins to God alone sufficed.[2] Likewise, in 1321 the Parisian theologian John of Pouilly was believed to have preached at a council in Reims that the pope did not possess the authority to enjoin annual confession on Christendom in the first place.[3]

But other witnesses, better credentialed ones, corroborated aspects of these contentions. The perfectly orthodox canon lawyer Panormitanus (d. 1445), for example, stated rather matter-of-factly that no overt authority indicates that God or Christ explicitly instituted confession to a priest.[4] The paucity of scriptural support for Lateran IV's mandate was complemented by the fact that evidence for auricular confession is embarrassingly thin before the appearance of the penitentials in the seventh century. Even after their advent, the practice of auricular confession does not seem to have been widespread.[5] Furthermore, despite the quickening of twelfth-century interest in confession for its salient role in the larger penitential process, religious authorities never suggested that confession was in accordance with divine law. When thirteenth-century theologians, in

the wake of Lateran IV, attempted to do so, it was only with the greatest difficulty.[6] The matter was, however, finally, although awkwardly, settled when the Council of Trent elevated the belief in the divine origin of confession to an article of faith.[7]

But the invention of auricular confession as a mandated sacrament did not exist outside of time. As part of the newly articulated sacramental system, confession was a response to a set of contemporaneous spiritual concerns. From the ecclesiastical hierarchy's perspective, it was linked with the fight against heresy; on an individual level, it reflected the turn toward interiority that contemporary piety favored. Moreover, sacramental confession further resonated with the rise of judicial confession in an ever expanding number of ecclesiastical and secular tribunals. A certain amount of interpenetration between different confessional systems was inevitable. The present chapter will examine how the contemporary emphasis on confession fostered a steady movement between fora, before turning to the ways in which female spirituality was deeply implicated in this confessional culture.

HERESY AND LATERAN IV

Lateran IV was largely framed in response to heresy, particularly that of the dualist Cathars of southern France. A number of canons are very explicit about this purpose. On a disciplinary level, Canon 3 outlined a series of depositions and confiscations that a heretic must suffer. Bent on en-listing the orthodox laity's active persecution of their heretical neighbors, the canon not only articulated dire consequences for temporal lords who refused to act against heretical subordinates, but it further consolidated Innocent III's earlier use of the Crusade for suppressing heresy.[8]

Other initiatives of a more symbolic nature were equally implicated in the council's antiheretical impetus. For instance, from a doctrinal perspective, the council's opening canon is a detailed declaration of faith that coins the term "transubstantiation" to describe the change that comes over the eucharistic bread and wine at the moment of consecration.[9] This insistence on the material presence of Christ was intended as a direct rebuttal to the Cathars' rejection of the sacrament —a rejection that was grounded in their dualistic abhorrence of the material world and incumbent denial that Christ had ever assumed an incarnate body.[10] Indeed, the council's general attempt to mount a defense via the sacramental system is also evident in its efforts to stabilize the institution of marriage, which was under attack by heretical dualists. Its inclusion on the definitive list of sacraments, developed over the course of the twelfth century, was clearly a

response to both heretical dualism and antisacramentality.[11]

Omnis utriusque sexus, Canon 21's groundbreaking ordinance on confession, should be placed on a continuum with these other measures:

> All the faithful of either sex, after they have reached the age of discernment, should individually confess all their sins in a faithful manner to their own priest at least once a year, and let them take care to do what they can to perform the penance imposed on them. Let them reverently receive the sacrament of the eucharist at least at Easter unless they think, for a good reason and on the advice of their own priest, that they should abstain from receiving it for a time. Other-wise they shall be barred from entering a church during their lifetime and they shall be denied a Christian burial at death. Let this salutary decree be frequently published in churches, so that nobody may find the pretence of an excuse in the blindness of ignorance.[12]

Even as the universal mandate to confess was unprecedented, so were the methods through which it was enforced, essentially calling for ipso facto excommunication.[13]

A stable confessional relationship with the same priest would clearly facilitate the task of surveillance. Thus, some fifty years later, when proffering a six-point rationale for *Omnis utriusque*, Bonaventure (d. 1274) reasons in his fourth point that "the obedient are discerned from the disobedient or heretics through the observance of such a statute."[14] Local synodal injunctions made it clear that priests were obliged to keep track of those who did not comply, although the degree to which these lists circulated to higher disciplinary bodies remains less clear.[15] It quite apparent from heretical trials that certain members of the laity understood confession as a type of surveillance. Authors of manuals for inquisitors complained that suspected heretics would come to confession hoping to pass as orthodox—a ruse that can, indeed, be found among inquisitional records. 16 Moreover, from its formal inception, auricular confession was also almost immediately used catechismically for remedial instruction in the faith. Such soundings, which measured the depth of orthodox indoctrination, would further disclose heretical leanings.

Amid this aura of innovation, however, it should also be noted that Canon 21 in many ways evolved from a recognizable body of doctrines and practices.[17] As early as the mid–tenth century, one finds isolated instances of bishops encouraging annual confession,[18] while in the early years of the thirteenth century a small number of bishops attempted to introduce regular auricular confession into their

synods.[19] The penitential movement, distinguished by a desire to confess sins and perform penance in the world, had steadily gained ground since the eleventh century. The twelfth century had also manifested a new interiority and sensitivity to the realm of the conscience, particularly stressing the centrality of inward contrition in the remission of sins.[20]

The contritionist position, first articulated by Peter Abelard, maintained the sufficiency of inward remorse for the forgiveness of sins, a stance that could theoretically dispense with outward confession altogether. 21 While this contention would be modified by subsequent scholars, theologians would nevertheless continue to prioritize inward contrition over outer confession until the mid–thirteenth century.[22] Canon 21 of Lateran IV helps to undermine the contritionist platform by isolating and foregrounding verbal confession against the rest of the penitential process. Thus alternative views, such as Abelard's perception of the sinner spurning God (*peccatum-contemptus*) as reconciled by a penitence of love (*poenitentia-amor*), gave way to the perception of the penitent as arraigned before his or her priestly judge.[23] The rising power of the priest is signified by the standard formula for absolution that emerged. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) will thus defend the phrase "I absolve you" as the correct form for the sacrament of penance, rather than the more deflected "May Almighty God grant you absolution." By John Gerson's time (d. 1429) the matter was settled. But John will concede in his miniature treatise on the subject that the priest might add "by the authority of the church," although this was by no means necessary.[24]

A CRISIS IN PROOF AND THE RISE OF JUDICIAL CONFESSION

Foucault has identified Lateran IV as a central moment in establishing "confession as one of the main rituals we rely on for the production of truth."[25] There is no question that confession was thus established as the essential marker or "proof" of orthodoxy. A similar claim might also be made for the eucharist, since Canon 21 likewise mandated its reception for the faithful. Even so, a subtle hierarchy was simultaneously inscribed within this set of proofs: a Christian could withhold him-or herself from the eucharist by reason of piety without necessarily arousing suspicion, but not from confession—a consideration at odds with the acknowledgment of many authorities that one need not confess unless he or she has committed a mortal sin.[26] Indeed, the close association of confession and communion suggested in the wording of Canon 21 generated the view that the one was a precondition for the other, bringing the two practices closer

together.[27] Two of Bonaventure's rationales for *Omnis utriusque*,for example, sequentially link confession and the eucharist. Thus he argues that confession will, on the one hand, permit the priest to know who is worthy of receiving the sacrament of the altar, while, on the other hand, allowing the faithful to purge themselves before approaching the Lord's body.[28] Aquinas will similarly argue that an unconfessed sinner com-pounds his sin by receiving the sacrament.[29] The two sacraments will eventually be formally joined at the Council of Trent when this hitherto recommended sequence becomes a precept in the event that a person is conscious of a mortal sin.[30]

The emergence of auricular confession as a preferred proof of orthodoxy coincides with the beginnings of an immense shift in contemporary systems of establishing proof, most concretely represented in the decline of the ordeal and the gradual rise of the inquisitional procedure.[31] Traditionally, Germanic kingdoms had looked to the ordeal for illumination in many situations of uncertainty. Functionally, the ordeal was understood to make the hidden manifest by a direct appeal to God. Through a solemn invocation (called a *conjuratio* in many liturgies), God was besought to speak through the verdict. The outcome of the ordeal was thus perceived as divinely ordained proof—hence the appellation *iudicium Dei*. It was, as Peter Brown has characterized it, a "controlled miracle." The utility of the ordeal spread far beyond proofs that one might designate as simply legal, or, to put it in a way that more truly captures the medieval sense of justice, necessarily extends our modern understanding of the law.[32]

Despite the occasional ecclesiastical qualms over the legitimacy of ordeals, clerics accepted them as part of the normative legal procedure throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In fact, the ordeal continued to be applied to church affairs well into the thirteenth century.[33] But despite the seemingly unapologetic continuance of such procedures, a crisis of doubt was gaining momentum that would eventually precipitate the decline of this formerly indispensable mechanism of proof.[34] Lateran IV again achieves prominence as the formal channel for the articulation of change and the mechanism of displacement. Canon 18 forbade clerical participation in the ordeal, thereby robbing the ritual of its efficacy.[35] In keeping with the growing separation between a sacred and a profane realm, a stricter delineation of which arose during the Gregorian Reform, the clergy retreated into the sacred, taking their holy implements with them. The change is interestingly signaled by the new protections that were instituted around the eucharist—which could no longer be administered prior to the ordeal, let alone be used as an ordeal in its own right. Thus Aquinas, citing Pope Stephen V (d. 885), an early

critic of ordeals, would assert:

> "The sacred canons do not allow of a confession being extorted [*extorqueri*] from any person by trial with hot iron or boiling water. It is for our state authorities to judge of public crimes which are committed and made evident by spontaneous confession or the proof of witnesses: private and unknown crimes are left to him who alone knows the hearts of the sons of men." . . . Tempting God [*Dei tentatio*] seems present in all such ordeals, and so their practice cannot be free from sin. And it would seem the graver were anybody to receive the death-sentence through this sacrament, which was instituted to be a saving remedy. Consequently Christ's body should absolutely never be given to a suspect as part of his examination.[36]

In short, in the course of proving the guilt or innocence of an individual, Christendom had hitherto resorted to testing or "proving" God. This must stop. The host would henceforth be reserved for the two kinds of proof envisaged by Lateran IV: its transubstantiated nature proved the miraculous powers of the sacrament and clergy alike against heretical aspersions,[37] even as mandatory reception of the sacrament proved the orthodoxy of the faithful. New applications, moreover, were found for the Pauline text that had paved the way for the eucharist as an ordeal: "But let a man prove himself: and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgement to himself" (1 Cor. 11.27–28).[38] Theologians such as Aquinas would use this passage to underline the Christian's need to con-fess before receiving the host.[39]

But if Lateran IV precipitated a crisis in proof, it also pointed to its possible resolution. In particular, Canon 8, entitled "On Inquests" (*De inquisitionibus*), introduced the inquisitional procedure to the church, thus capping a series of Innocent III's decretals that date back to 1198. Directing his strictures not to secular princes but to ecclesiastical prelates, Innocent III set out the basic rules for investigating the wrongdoings of a subordinate.

> Not only when a subject has committed some excess but also when a prelate has done so, and the matter reaches the ears of the superior through an outcry or rumour which has come not from the malevolent and slanderous but from prudent and honest persons, and has come not only once but frequently (as the outcry suggests and the rumour proves), then the superior ought diligently to seek out the truth before senior persons of the church. . . . However, the

> superior should carry out the duty of his office not as if he were the accuser and the judge but rather with the rumour providing the accusation and the outcry making the denunciation. . . . The person about whom the inquiry is being made ought to be present, unless he absents himself out of contumacy. The articles of the inquiry should be shown to him so that he may be able to defend himself. The names of witnesses as well as their depositions are to be made known to him so that both what has been said and by whom will be apparent.[40]

An importation from Roman law (hence the allusion in Pope Stephen's precocious objection to the ordeal, cited by Aquinas), the inquest (or inquisition) was not reliant on the accusatorial process that sustained the mechanism behind the ordeal. Rather, the judge was empowered to proceed ex officio on the basis of rumor alone.

The new system soon spread from ecclesiastical to secular tribunals, taking up all the space formerly occupied by the ordeal and then some. This transition from personal accusation to the allegedly more disinterested inquest both coincided with and confirmed the tendency toward centralized authority apparent in church and state alike.[41] Yet the abandonment of the ordeal and the incumbent shift from accusatorial to inquisitional procedure left behind a residue of uncertainty in the judges' minds as to what constituted impeccable proof. As a result, there was an increased emphasis on obtaining a full confession as the singular means of establishing certainty. Moreover, this emphasis will, in turn, soon lead to the reintroduction of torture, another legacy of Roman law, as an infallible means of securing the requisite proof. It is certainly no accident that the most common euphemism for torture was, in fact, the Latin word for proof: *probatio*.[42]

That the same council privileged confession in two ostensibly separate venues is hardly adventitious. The concurrence reflected the double genius of Innocent III, whose theological background supplemented the legal training that he shared with a distinguished line of canon lawyer popes. In other words, Innocent's legal acumen, particularly his knowledge of Roman law, was interpenetrated by all the theological emphases on the sacraments current at the University of Paris.[43] His legal training alone might have predisposed the advancement of confession over the rest of the penitential process, as articulated by Lateran IV.

Moreover, this timely emphasis on sacramental confession, corresponding, as it did, to the increasing prominence of judicial confession, necessarily cast into stark relief the parallels between the penitential process and the punitive nature of criminal law. While

etymologically implicit in the correspondence between *poena* (punishment) and *poenitentia* (penance), it was an association that the church had sporadically attempted to efface. 44 Lateran IV itself does not allude to the priest's quasi-judicial role, instead preferring to describe him in terms of the more reassuring and traditional medicinal imagery:

> The priest shall be discerning and prudent, so that like a skilled doctor he may pour wine and oil over the wounds of the injured one. Let him carefully inquire about the circumstances of both the sinner and the sin so that he may prudently discern what sort of medical advice he ought to give and what remedy to apply, using various means to heal the sick person.[45]

As Nicole Bériou has indicated, there was a constant and often uneasy theological vacillation between medical and judicial metaphors in thirteenth- century discussions of confession.[46] But the two discourses were not as antagonistic as is frequently supposed. The judicial metaphors frequently staged a return in the context of the physician's diagnostic function, which bore undeniable similarities to a judicial interrogation. This similarity, already implicit in Lateran IV's dutifully inquisitive physician, becomes still more apparent in Peter of Poitiers's manual for confessors, produced soon after the council. In a prolonged meditation on the medical motif in Canon 21, the priest/doctor is advised to approach the sick person with soothing words and comfort him with promises of healing, with God's help. The sick person is, in turn, encouraged to reveal the extent of his illness. The priest should follow up by asking when the illness arose, the present age of the invalid, the sex, the cause of the illness, and its duration. The individual's gender, customs, and social status should all be probed. Finally, the vehemence of the attack, the patient's physical deportment, and even facial expressions should be carefully assessed.[47]

William of Auvergne, theologian and bishop of Paris between 1228 and 1249, had no scruples about drawing on both medicinal and judicial images indiscriminately. Although often likening the priest to a midwife or confession itself to a therapeutic bout of vomiting,[48] his exploration of the judicial motif is especially painstaking. "It is necessary therefore that God have a court [*curia*] or place for hearing cases [*auditorium*] where those fit to be judged are judged and those fit to be compensated are compensated. The *auditorium* or *consistory* cannot exercise proper judgment unless they have the accusation [*accusatio*] and the testimony [*testificatio*]." [49] The penitent, arraigned as a criminal, is expected spontaneously to accuse and testify against

himself.[50] The confessor is, in turn, cast as a bailiff, jealously guarding his Lord's property and proceeding against thieves and traitors of various stripes.[51] While certain contemporaries, such as Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas,[52] are extremely leery of pursuing such analogies,William cannot resist lining up as many parallels as possible, unguardedly justifying spiritual mores by recourse to secular practice: "for if civil and secular cases are pursued and examined in the presence of rectors or judges, cases thus involving souls or spiritual things should also be aired in the presence of rectors of souls or judges."[53]

Yet even William recognized the need to emphasize crucial differences. Of particular salience was the fact that judicial confession was frequently extorted, while the Christian penitent's confession was voluntary.[54] Thus while torments of various kinds abound in William's penitential system, these are assumed voluntarily. The penitent's willing mortification is at one with submission to God.

> Among the repentant . . . not only does the person not resist justice but he even helps it: for when he judges himself, and tortures himself [*torquet*], he who repents also exposes himself to the divine justice for torturing according to his own good pleasure.[55]

William's torments are not torture in the new legal sense—that is, pain impressed in order to extract a confession—although the word may be the same. The pains endured are instead punishments willingly embraced after the deed has been confessed to appease and please an angry God.

A PILLAR OF BLOOD: RAYMOND OF PEÑAFORT

While the increasing emphasis on verbal confession in both spiritual and secular arenas invited the imaginative excurses of William of Auvergne in Paris, a solidification of such comparisons was occurring farther south with the rise of fledgling tribunals for prosecuting heretics. Since heresy was both a sin and a crime, the actual status of a heretic's confession—made, after all, to a priest who sought the heretic's salvation—was necessarily ambiguous. (In recognition of this difficulty, prosecuting clerics would be forbidden to hear the confessions of penitent heretics.)[56] The Catalan canonist Raymond of PeÑafort would be responsible for making the two types of confession still more proximate through his successful promotion of the inquisitional process for obtaining sacramental and heretical confessions alike.[57]

A brilliant canon lawyer who studied and then taught at the celebrated University of Bologna, Raymond joined the Dominicans in

1222—a new and papally sponsored order that was formalized soon after Lateran IV precisely to combat heresy.[58] He was summoned to Rome to act as papal penitentiary, chaplain, and confessor to Pope Gregory IX in 1230. Yet despite his auspicious positioning in the papal curia, Raymond was entirely resistant to his own advancement in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. When Gregory IX attempted to elevate Raymond to the archbishopric of Tarragona, he refused adamantly, even withstanding the opprobrium of papal excommunication.[59] Returning to Barcelona in 1234 because of illness, Raymond was nevertheless elected to the position of master general of the Dominican order in 1238, a position he was forced to resign within two years, again for reasons of ill-health.[60] Raymond lived out the remain-der of his life among his Dominican community at Barcelona, where he continued to retain the title and many of the responsibilities of papal penitentiary. He died in 1275.

Raymond played a central role in the evolution of canon law in this period. Immediately after his arrival at Rome, he was commissioned by Gregory IX to organize the papal decrees into a coherent canonical collection, completed in 1234 and known as the *Decretals*.[61] His pastoral work was equally influential. The magisterial *Summa of Penance* was begun soon after his entrance into the Dominicans and exemplified the pastoral orientation of the order's vocation. An example of the newly emerging genre of confessors' manuals, circulating in the wake of Lateran IV, Raymond's *Summa* was designed to instruct priests in their newly acquired task of hearing confession. The revised and augmented version of the *Summa*, completed in 1234, was one of the most influential works of its kind, serving as the template for subsequent confessors' manuals.[62]

The various judicial feints and analogues in earlier writers are reified in the preface of Raymond's work when he introduces the concept of a "penitential forum" (*forum penitentiale*) instituted for the "judgment of souls."[63] Indeed, the very rubrics of his *Summa* are taken from contemporary canon law collections, apparently in an attempt to synchronize the individual penitent's conscience with ecclesiastical law. Moreover, the confessor, as spiritual judge, assumes heavy interrogational responsibilities, a method that Raymond defends in the course of addressing the problem of "whether interrogations should be made." First noting that some individuals argue against interrogations, owing to the simplicity and shame of individuals, Raymond counters this view with an excerpt from the pseudo-Augustinian treatise on penance:

> "Let the spiritual judge beware . . . lest he fail in his responsibility for knowledge. It behoves him to know whatsoever he is required to judge. For the judiciary power

> requires this so that he may discern what he is obliged to judge. The careful inquisitor [*diligens . . . inquisitor*] therefore is a subtle investigator who wisely and as it were astutely interrogates the sinner about what perhaps he may overlook or wish to hide from shame. Thus recognize the crime [*crimine*], and do not hesitate to investigate its various aspects, the spot, and time, et cetera."[64]

Subduing hypothetical hesitation by recourse to the potent authority of Augustine (d. 430), Raymond then proceeds to outline the proper procedure for interrogations in a terse couplet—rhymed for mnemonic purposes.

Who, what, where, through whom, how many times, why, how, when: These things should be observed when applying the medicine.[65] In the course of Raymond's merging of judicial and medicinal metaphors, the courtroom seems to prevail over the sickbed. The remainder of this chapter proceeds to expand on each of these points of inquiry, utilizing judicial language throughout.

Raymond was, in essence, suggesting that the sacrament of penance should follow the contours of an inquisitional process, a procedure with which his legal training made him intimately familiar.[66] He further en-sured that the protocol for an inquisition was safely secured in contemporary canon law: the first title of book 5 of his *Decretals* is "On Accusations, Inquisitions, and Denunciations."[67] While in the context of his *Summa* Raymond employs the term *interrogationes* to describe his system of inquiry, *inquisitiones* would be equally appropriate. And, in fact, later confessors' manuals or manuals preparing the penitent for confession will use the term *inquisitiones*.[68]

The methods of the first papal inquisitors against heresy, appointed by Gregory IX, were unsystematic, to say the least.[69] It was Raymond who introduced the same confessional/inquisitional initiative to the prosecution of heresy that was already present in his confessors' manual.[70] Yet although his role in the establishment of the inquisition against heresy was central, his hand was frequently concealed.[71] In 1234, writing in the pope's name, Raymond redacted a number of canonical responses to problems presented by the mission of the two mendicant orders in Tunis, a number of which bore on questions of heresy.[72] According to Peter Marsilio, a Dominican from Barcelona writing at the end of the thirteenth century, Raymond was behind King James of Aragon's request to establish an inquisition in order to exterminate the threat of heresy in his lands, which resulted in the papal bull to the bishop of Tarragona of 1232. [73] When Raymond himself refused the archbishopric of Tarragona two years later, he was asked to name the new incumbent and, accordingly, chose someone he knew would continue to purge the area of heretics.[74] Finally,

Raymond was further involved in a series of consultations with the archbishop of Tarragona regarding the prosecution and treatment of heretics. One of these, undertaken in 1242, underlines how heretics should be treated in prison as well as various criteria for proof of culpability.[75] Such consultations eventuated in a set of guidelines for the prosecution of heresy—an unquestionable precedent that would serve as a model for subsequent inquisitional manuals.[76]

In a compelling comparison of confessors' manuals with inquisitional manuals, Annie Cazenave demonstrates that the two genres, both oriented toward extracting a "voluntary" confession and instilling true contrition, were, from a certain perspective, inseparable processes.[77] As author of one of the earliest and most influential of confessors' manuals as well as the motive force behind the earliest set of inquisitional guidelines, Raymond oversaw this conflation. But he attempted still more: he wanted to make the two confessional tribunals cooperative, subordinating the secrecy of an individual's sacramental confession to the welfare of the church. This impetus is evident in Raymond's consultation of 1242.

> If someone who formerly believed the heretics is cited in court and confesses spontaneously [*confitetur sponte*], that is without fear of torture [*non metu probationum vel tormentorum*], but saying that he has amended himself from the crime and was reconciled in secret confession and is prepared to prove [*probare*] this through his confessor; if the crime was secret, so that beyond confession no other proofs [*probationes*] are to be had, it seems that the testimony of the confessor should suffice in this matter—if the latter is a discreet man of good reputation. If, however, such a confession was made not spontaneously but out of dread or if the crime was not hidden, it seems that the judgment should proceed further, according to discreet men, especially if, according to the knowledge of his confessor and the proofs [*probationes*] found against him [the defendant], he is able to be convicted for having kept silent about certain errors in confession, though it should always be taken into consideration as to whether this seems to have been done from simplicity or malice.[78]

Raymond's advice is suffused with a confident and untroubled sense of the easy permeability of sacramental and heretical tribunals—a confidence that betrays the assumption that the two were always intended as complements. The confessor, moreover, likewise moving between two tribunals, can work on behalf of either the defense or the prosecution of a penitent. This fluidity is also signaled in the overlapping uses of the words "proof" and "confess," which tend to confound efforts at neat distinction. The first evocation of the ubiquitous word "proofs" is actually a reference to torture, as the accompanying sister term "torments" makes clear. Such terminology suggests that torture, which was seen to advance lockstep with the spread of inquisitional procedure, was already glimpsed as a possibility at the very dawn of the papal inquisition against heretics.

A similar policy is articulated in the guidelines for prosecuting heresy, in which Raymond permits a former heretic or fautor (a suspected sup-porter of heretics) to be cleared by appealing to his confessor, who would in turn testify that the penitent had confessed and done penance for his sin. Raymond does, however, reflect that "the priest would have acted badly because he did not not remit [*remisit*] him"—an ambiguous reflection on the priest's responsibilities. It could simply mean that the confessor was expected to urge the penitent to report to the bishop so he could make a public abjuration of his heresy. Another possible reading is that the priest was required to send in the former heretic's name, with or with-out the approval of his penitent.[79] An entire chapter is devoted to how penitents should be interrogated by their confessors in the course of sacra-mental confession as to whether they are aware of any heretics, or their fautors. All information thus elicited should be written up faithfully and presented before the bishop or his representative by the confessor, who should also have his penitent-informant in tow. If the latter does not want this information revealed, "the priest ought nonetheless to seek counsel from learned and God-fearing men, though not specifying the person [i.e.,the confessee], on how to proceed further."[80] Although the informant's name has been withheld in this context, at least temporarily, the names of those accused of heretical activities would, presumably, be cited, while "learned and God-fearing men" would probably discuss whether or not the hapless informant could be forced to testify.

The potential for traffic between penitential and antiheretical fora is most dramatically opened up in the *Summa on Penance*, where Raymond embarks on an interesting piece of casuistry that actually pits the celebrated secrecy (or "seal") of sacramental confession expressly against the church's fear of heresy. Moreover, as Raymond makes clear in the prologue to his *Summa*, this very explicit treatment was intended for the relatively humble priest as opposed to the trained inquisitor, giving this advice a very different kind of salience.[81] Raymond begins his discussion of the seal with an enumeration of penalties that await a confessor who reveals a confession, including the most recent sanctions enjoined by Innocent III at Lateran IV: deposition and imprisonment in a strict monastery.[82] But then the mitigating circumstance of heresy is introduced through a series of shifting lenses. Suppose that a confessor is confronted by an unrepentant heretic, who will confess only his other sins? or by someone who is prepared to give up heresy but will not name his former heretical confederates? Or what if he names them but does not wish the priest to reveal their names—whether because he took a vow of secrecy or because he fears retaliation? What is the priest to do?

Raymond answers that according to some men, the priest should go to the bishop and tell him to beware and keep careful watch over his sheep because a wolf is loose. Or else he can reveal the information to someone who can profit but will not harm the person of heretical leanings.[83] But then Raymond goes on to proffer his own utilitarian view on the confessional rights of the unrepentant heretic.

> It seems that the priest is not bound on account of the power of [the sacrament of] penance first because he [the confessee] did not do penance and then because he does not preserve the faith since he is a heretic and an infidel. And therefore faith should not be kept with such a person.[84]

In other words, although the category of heresy is premised on a baptized individual's ongoing and indeed compulsory membership in the church, the heretic has nevertheless forfeited the usual protections that his or her now irksome faith would have afforded. What remains is compulsion. Moreover, the *Summa*'s concluding comment on heresy lowers the bar considerably as to where suspicions of heresy should begin: "In sum, note that a person wavering in faith is an infidel [*dubius in fide infidelis est*], nor are those who are ignorant of the faith of truth entirely to be believed."[85]

A formal petition for Raymond's canonization was made within four years of his death, a fact that comes as little surprise considering his prominence in the papal and Dominican circles, as well as the scholarly world at large.[86] Even so, a compelling case for sanctity would be difficult to craft from achievements that were so academic and institutional at a time when, as we will see, hagiographical culture was progressively favoring qualities like poverty, mysticism, and miraculous somatism. How would his achievements stack up against such flamboyant competition?

An anonymous life, written before 1351 and accompanying his process of canonization, does its best to bring the great canon lawyer's achievements into line with some of the current trends. This task was certainly facilitated by Raymond's ill-health. Thus his refusal of the archbishopric was eventually tolerated when "he was seized by a continual fever for three days and was in the greatest torture in body and mind, until the Lord Pope, at the instance and importuning of certain cardinals, absolved him from this office and freed him from obedience."[87] Moreover, in his capacity as confessor to Gregory IX, the pope gave him the nickname "the father of the poor." This was because Raymond frequently imposed on his papal penitent, in place of penance, the task of hearing the legal petitions of the deserving poor.[88] Raymond's remarkable scholarly achievements were also recast. Thus the writing of the *Summa of Penance* is described as an act

of humility and obedience, undertaken only at the repeated requests of his brothers. The commission of the *Decretals* is likened to Christ's voluntary assumption of the cross, which, borne in humble obedience, seemed light.[89] And Raymond's first miracle—which is also the one that is most compelling, and most fully described—fittingly relates how Raymond was responsible for restoring the powers of speech to a dying man so that the latter could make his confession.[90]

But the anonymous life, interestingly, did not avail itself of the spectacular miracle attending his election as master of the Dominican order:

> A miracle occurred in the election of Master Raymond of PeÑafort. . . . Once the [electors] were shut in, every one else returned to the church praying and beseeching the Lord that he should provide them with a suitable shepherd. . . . A certain devout brother then stood before the tomb of the blessed father [Dominic], and, with the hand of the Lord upon him, he saw through images in a certain vision all the electors leaving the room and proceeding to the church. They erected unanimously a single marble column bespattered with drops of blood from top to bottom, which reaching from the floor of the church and touching the ceiling, helped keep up the rest of the entire church. . . . Scarcely was there time to say one nocturn when behold: the electors left the room and, calling the chapter, announced that Brother Raymond of PeÑafort was unanimously chosen. . . . The brothers were exultant that so holy and so famous a man was divinely given to them; the scholars especially rejoiced about so out-standing and excellent a man as master. And that day, by chance, the reading in the refectory was, with God ordaining, from the Book of Joel: "Children of Sion, rejoice, and be joyful in the Lord your God: because he has given you a teacher of justice" (2.23).[91]

The tale of Raymond's election is from the eyewitness account of Stephen of Salagnac. It would be retold in about 1300 by another Dominican, Bernard Gui, the famous inquisitor and author of one of the most widely circulated of inquisitional manuals. But the episode was related in a much more condensed fashion with no indication of how the visions should be understood.[92] The anonymous life was written at least several decades later, possibly by Nicolas Eymeric (d. 1399)—also a Dominican confrere, renowned inquisitor, and author of yet another celebrated inquisitional manual. But whoever wrote the life was surely aware that inquisitors made poor candidates for

sanctity. And, indeed, Raymond's pivotal role in the creation of the inquisition may well have compromised his case. In any event, by the time that the anonymous hagiographer was writing, a bloody pillar representing a teacher of justice had lost its savor. Silence hangs over Raymond's exertions on behalf of the inquisition, not only in the vita itself but, with the exception of Peter Marsilio, in all contemporary references as well.[93] Repeated efforts on behalf of Raymond's canonization foundered, probably because his achievements were too arcane and recondite to inspire a popular following. He may also have been hampered by his association with the inquisition, which, as will be seen below, was a decided liability. His case was reopened by Pope Paul III in 1542. The timing is significant. This was the same year that Clement, responding to the threat of Protestantism, would establish the reorganized and more centralized Roman Inquisition.[94]

THE SEAL OF CONFESSION AND "KNOWING AS GOD"

"Confess your sins to the priest and after they will make fun of you and joke among themselves about your sins." (Petrus Maurinus (fl. 1320), shepherd of Montaillou)[95]

Despite Lateran IV's heavy sanctions against the offending confessor who revealed the contents of a confession, certain authorities clearly sympathized with Raymond's view that the sacrament should, under certain circumstances, be made to work in favor of the health of Christ's corporate body. Innocent III himself may have been of this persuasion—despite the fact that most scholastic defenses of the seal entail a citation of Lateran IV's weighty injunctions, frequently invoking Innocent by name.[96] But the council foregrounded the sacraments' salvific function in the conferral of grace as well as their utility in policing the church. A roughly contemporaneous anecdote by the Cistercian monk Caesarius of Heisterbach shows how the latter motive could simultaneously both defend and overwhelm the former, thus emphasizing the pragmatic vein in Innocent's theological initiatives. Apparently an unordained monk confessed sacramentally to his abbot that he was in the habit of performing illicit masses. Nor had he any intention of desisting, cringing before the shame of discovery that would inevitably follow the cessation of his fictive celebrations. The despairing abbot referred the problem to the papal curia, where the cardinals and various learned men consulted agreed almost unanimously (*omnibus pene in hoc consentientibus*) that the monk's confession must be protected. Innocent III, however, adamantly opposed this view, arguing instead that "such a confession is no confession at all, but sheer blasphemy; and the confessor has no

right to conceal so infamous a madness and bring disaster on the whole church."[97] The monk should be exposed. Moreover, this view would be circulated in later exempla collections under suggestive headings such as "That a confessor in some cases is not bound to conceal the confession."[98] Toward the end of the thirteenth century, Rotlandus de Valle Brito's similar usurpation of the power to perform mass was treated by the papal inquisitors of Toulouse as if it were a heresy—a designation that would have automatically suspended his confessional rights according to Raymond of PeÑafort's way of thinking.[99]

Some of the earliest reports of the mendicant orders' confessional activities betray similar discrepancies in the observance of the seal. The mendicant orders were fostered by the papacy, at least in part, to implement Lateran IV's mandate for annual confession, acting both as preachers to educate the laity in their new penitential role and as confessors to supplement the overtaxed parochial clergy.[100] It is certainly ironic that the first extant testimony to the Franciscans' responsibility of hearing lay confessions was framed in the context of their purported breach of the seal—a breach occurring in the course of their preaching, no less. Thus in a bull of 1234 addressed to the duke of Austria, Gregory IX performs a rearguard defense of the order by denouncing "certain men of perverted hearts," who have reported to the duke that "certain of the Friars Minor dwelling in [his] land revealed the secrets of confession through certain circumlocutions in their preaching."[101] The mendicant dual function of confessor-inquisitor may also have been tempting fate: certainly among the heretics of southern France, the Dominicans had the reputation for breaking the seal of confession with impunity.[102] An ominous exemplum by James of Vitry (d. 1240) further relates some awkward confessional exchanges that occurred between the early Dominicans and various religious women in the Low Countries. "Certain of the said women showed their infirmities and temptations and the failing of their fragile nature to those men just as they would to religious men, in order to be helped particularly by their prayers. But those men not only rashly suspected them to be otherwise, but in different lay and clerical congregations . . . they preached that the renowned communities of holy virgins were really prostitutes rather than religious groups and thus the defects of the few were poured out to all . . . [and] they scandalized many."[103]

Indeed, Thomas of Cantimpré(d. ca. 1272), an ardent admirer of James, might even be cast as one of those indiscreet preachers. Thomas produced an ambitious collection of spiritual anecdotage known as *Concerning Bees*. This work used the figure of the well-regulated life of bees—a species much admired in late antiquity and

the Middle Ages for its industry, self-discipline, and purported chastity—to meditate on the state of contemporary spirituality, generally, in conjunction with the development of the Dominican order. A central strategy for Thomas in authorizing his work is to stress his firsthand knowledge. In particular, the formula "when I was hearing confession for the episcopacy of Cambrai," or variants thereof, achieves a potentially dangerous prominence.[104] Nor does he restrict his account to his own confessional experience; he further volunteers some very explicit details drawn from the experiences of others as well: "The Venerable Boniface, formerly bishop of Lausanne, now rector in theology at Paris reported to me that a certain cleric that he himself heard in confession was accustomed to this bad practice [of masturbation] and provoked himself by illicit touchings."[105] In one passage in particular, Thomas offers himself up as a veritable untapped treasure trove of Dominican sin:

> I am unaware of what may happen in other religious orders, nor if I were to know is it my role to judge. But about the Dominican order, certainly more familiar and known to me, I know almost all those of the holy order who fell into scandal. . . . I believe, however, that to this very day, in which I presently write this book, there is one from that order whom the Lord Jesus Christ in his piety guarded most sweetly with his grace. And this is what he experienced—he who followed the ways of bishops into different regions while hearing confessions.[106]

This passage establishes Thomas beyond question as an insider, and a pure one at that.

While providing an impressive evidentiary base that adds credibility to his account, such reportage can only undermine the seal of confession. Confessional authorities argue against precisely the kind of instantiation that Thomas almost routinely provides in his anecdotes. But one need not look to confessors' manuals alone to censure Thomas's practice: in the course of his indictment of indiscreet disclosures, Antoninus of Florence (d. 1459) will cite Humbert of Romans (d. 1277)—master general of the Dominican order at the time Thomas was writing *Concerning Bees* and to whom the work is dedicated. Humbert accordingly cautions that "one should never even say that 'in that abbey or castle or village or city in which I heard confessions, many sins of this kind occurred' because the simple would believe that one is revealing a confession."[107] Thomas habitually goes much further than this.

Various authorities would, in turn, be sympathetic to the anxiety that indiscretions, malicious or inadvertent, must generate. There is an

exemplum that turns on a priest's revealing a wife's confession to her husband. 108 One of the few legitimate reasons that a penitent might avoid his or her parish priest and seek another confessor was if the confessor was a notorious betrayer of confessions.[109]

These and other depredations were in the air in the wake of Lateran IV. Hence it is not surprising that, with Bonaventure and Aquinas taking the lead, most theologians would rally around the seal of confession by refuting Raymond of PeÑafort's assumption of the complicity between the respective confessional fora. Bonaventure maintained that, in the case of the heretic who refused to repent, as with other instances of individuals who seemed intent on perpetrating sins that would affect others,[110] a confessor was obliged to remain silent. At the most, the priest was permitted to warn the bishop to be vigilant of his flock.[111] Any other line of action might provoke a serious scandal.[112]

Aquinas also vigorously resisted hypothetical encroachments on the seal of confession, since, to his mind, the essence of the sacrament was the act of concealment. "God indeed hides the sin of him who subjects himself to God through penance. Whereupon it is fitting that this be signified in the sacrament of penance. And on that account, it is from the necessity of the sacrament that someone conceals a confession, while he who reveals it is like a violator of the sacrament." He adds, incidentally as it were, that there are "certain other utilities" for this concealment: particularly, it is much easier to attract penitents if they know that their confessions will be kept secret.[113] When Aquinas succinctly restates aspects of his position in a quodlibetal question,[114] he will argue that revealing a confession, even that of a heretic, goes against the "truth of the sacrament"—the integrity of which is in no way lessened by a sinner's hardened resistance to amendation.[115] He further champions the seal by according church statute the status of divine law (*de jure divina*). In so doing, Aquinas is both anticipating and preparing the way for the Council of Trent's mandate to this effect.[116]

These theological protections of the seal, including the rebuttal of Raymond's position regarding the unrepentant heretic, were picked up and endorsed by subsequent confessors' manuals, works that had considerably more impact on practice than would purely academic theological treatises. Of particular significance was Dominican John of Freiburg's *Summa confessorum*, completed by 1298, which would eventually surpass Raymond's manual in popularity. Although borrowing its format and much of the content from Raymond's earlier manual, John's *Summa* also incorporated the theological teachings of Thomas Aquinas, which he tended to endorse in his own deliberations.[117] When John of Freiburg embarks on his examination

of the seal of confession, the first question he raises is “whether the priest in every case is bound to conceal a confession”—a question inspiring a lengthy reiteration of Thomas Aquinas’s view, supplemented by other authorities who also support this position.

And yet any rebuttal of Raymond’s position was necessarily incomplete. Not only would his original manual, and hence his contested view, continue to be circulated, but his argument was necessarily repeated by those who sought to refute it. John of Freiburg’s treatment is a case in point. Although endorsing Aquinas’s position and according it pride of place, he nevertheless preserves Raymond’s opposing view, along with select supporters.

> Raymond, however, and Innocent [IV] posit the view held by some that when [a priest] knows something from confession which threatens some future danger, then he can reveal this to such men as are able to help, not hinder.[118]

Despite John’s concluding reiteration that this view was “entirely reproved by Thomas” and other theologians, the rejected alternative nevertheless remains available for potential use.[119] Moreover, while the priest’s ability to denounce a penitent on the basis of sacramental confession remains tacitly in circulation, the corresponding power of the priest to exculpate a former heretic by testifying to his confession and absolution was foreclosed. Already in 1243 the Council of Narbonne would disallow a priest’s testimony in this context—a view reiterated by subsequent manuals for inquisitors.[120]

But unavoidable gray areas remain even for those who policed the seal most vigorously. Bonaventure and Aquinas both permit a priest to reveal a confession, provided he has the permission of his penitent.[121] Bonaventure, in particular, raises a host of difficulties that he never manages to allay entirely. What if a person confesses a crime to silence a priest who had witnessed the incident? Does a priest sin mortally in hearing the confession about a crime he has witnessed? Is he at fault if he refuses to testify?[122] If the priest was a witness, could he subsequently refuse to accept the criminal’s confession under the protection of the seal of confession? 123 Bonaventure finally concludes that a confessed sin known through a medium other than sacramental confession could be revealed, but only if the priest is compelled under oath or by virtue of obedience.[124] A parallel problem arises in the event that someone divulges a secret which, strictly speaking, has nothing to do with the remission of sins—the true business of penance. According to Aquinas, the seal of confession was not perceived as extending to such disclosures, although authorities hasten to add that a priest should avoid revealing such matters unless absolutely necessary, owing to the danger of scandal.[125] This lesser

protection was often referred to as the seal of secrecy.

Such limits or exceptions to the seal were often the center of the rough-and-tumble of university exercises in the form of quodlibetal questions.[126] The very frequency of the seal as a point of contention is interesting insofar as these questions may have been framed in response to issues raised from the floor of a public lecture hall, resonating with the immediate concerns of the audience.[127] Thus Henry of Ghent, writing between 1276 and 1292 and whose preferred theological idiom seems to have been the quodlibet, will argue that the prelate who commissions another priest to hear someone's confession, insisting on a full report of the sins detailed, is within his rights—provided the penitent gives his consent.[128] Sometimes the incursions into the seal are very subtle, however. In the case of an abbot who is made aware through the confession of a monk entrusted with the cure of souls that he is corrupting his lay charges, the abbot is *not* permitted to report this offense to a superior. But he *is* permitted to remove the monk from office on some other pretext.[129] The seal is further eroded with the disparagement of lay confession, which had hitherto been an efficacious alternative when no priest was available. Thus Godefroid of Fontaines maintains in a disputation of 1295 that the seal of confession did not pertain to the lay confessor.[130]

Naturally, these casuistic projections of practical difficulties would be of intense interest to the authors of confessors' manuals. Angelo Carletti (d. 1495) will give a summary list of six motives that were widely acknowledged for revealing a confession: when the priest needed counsel about the nature of the sin or the appropriate penance to be assigned (although the penitent should remain anonymous); with the permission of the person confessing; when a person confesses that he or she intends to do something evil that will harm others; when the priest either has already heard or will subsequently hear of the sin through an independent source; if the priest learns of a conspiracy against his life; when the content of a confession involves neither a sin, nor the circumstances surrounding a sin, nor the betrayal of a secret.[131] Moreover, Angelo also recognizes the distinction between the seal of confession and the seal of secrecy arising in the course of a confession, the taboos protecting the latter being considerably less rigid.[132]

A number of these distinctions were, of course, hotly contested or in need of refinement. The rights to privacy of the person intending to do evil would remain controversial.[133] But other authorities challenged what seem to be more banal categories. Antoninus of Florence, although providing an important source for Angelo's *Summa*, was extremely reluctant to permit the revelation of a confession, even with the penitent's authorization. Citing Peter of Palude (d. 1342),

Antoninus—all too aware of how a judge might pressure a captive into authorizing a disclosure that would contribute to his own incrimination—insists that such a revelation should be made only if the confessor is absolutely certain this will benefit the penitent. If the penitent's coerced authorization acts to his own detriment, however, the confessor should remain silent: "Because the two fora, namely, the penitential forum and the contentious forum, ought not to be mixed up."[134]

But it was not enough to state emphatically that the different tribunals must invariably remain separate, since there were compelling reasons why they should not. One such argument for the commonweal appeals to the responsibilities priests shared with other members of society. Indeed, even the work of Aquinas himself could be used to frame a powerful argument for the individual's obligation to denounce certain malefactors. The heretic is perhaps the most compelling case in point, since Aquinas regards heresy as the most harmful of sins—personally and communally.[135] From the perspective of the community's health, Aquinas argues forcefully against the toleration of heretics, enlisting the medicinal imagery of surgical amputation as a justification for the death penalty.[136] In addition, Aquinas posited generally that the individual was bound to accuse those guilty of crimes that were harmful to society—a view that is heartily endorsed in the confessors' manuals like that of Bartholomew of Pisa (d. 1347).[137] Nor were such denunciations restricted to the community's well-being. In keeping with the spirit of Matt. 18.15–17, Aquinas substantially treats the subject of fraternal correction, demonstrating that it is a part of a Christian's responsibility to denounce his or her neighbor to the appropriate authority, provided that this be done in charity and only if the offender has ignored earlier admonitions to repent.[138] Such denunciations could assist in another's salvation, since Aquinas argued that the perpetrator of such a crime was sinning mortally by not making a public confession—a view cited by the *Summa angelica*.[139]

Finally, there is the priest's moral integrity to consider. A priest may well be interrogated as to his knowledge about a crime, and even required to take an oath, which was nothing less than invoking God as witness. Perjury, understood as lying under oath, was, by its very nature, a mortal sin because it implied a contempt of God.[140] Nor does one escape the taint of sin if one swears under compulsion.[141] Raymond of PeÑafort raises the question of the potential culpability of an individual who is compelled by his lord to swear, although he knows that he is committing perjury. His answer is implacable: "I say that both are perjured, and sin mortally—the lord, because he ordered, the knight or servant because he loved his temporal lord

more than God." Even the more theologically inflected John of Freiburg is in basic agreement with this position.[142] Moreover, in a culture the very social fabric of which was dependent on the oath for validation of a given utterance, and where all portentous assertions or undertakings were sealed by an oath, the reliability of a person's word was paramount. Even if an exception were to be made in the case of a priest pursuing his sacramental responsibilities, this could not but fail to impair his probity from a certain perspective. Must the confessor be expected to perjure himself in order to safeguard the seal of confession?

In this period of multiplying tribunals, and the concommitant splintering of allegiances, what was needed was a formula that would secure the integrity of the seal and the confessor alike. And one soon emerged. In the course of the *quaestio* "whether in any case one should be permitted to reveal a confession," which was posed precisely to contest the position upheld by Raymond of PeÑafort, Bonaventure argues that the penitent does not reveal his sins to a man, but to God—a position illustrated by recourse to a "great miracle" taken directly from the exemplum tradition. A man during a life-threatening storm at sea confessed his sins aloud. When the wind desisted, nobody remembered what he had said: "Wherefore the priest in like manner ought not to know, as if he had not heard and did not know."[143] In the face of the contention that people should never lie or perjure themselves, even to avoid scandal, Bonaventure unflinchingly defends the confessor's obligation to secrecy: "With regard to taking an oath, [the confessor] can safely say: I don't know. Nor does he perjure himself, because the oath binds him to say only what he knows as man, not as God."[144] Similarly, a priest should plead ignorance regarding his penitent's sins, even under oath, saying only "what he knows as man, not as God" (*quod novit ut homo, non ut Deus*).[145] Thomas Aquinas will likewise adopt this formula.[146] Even if a confessor is directly interrogated by a superior, under pain of excommunication, as to whether he possesses knowledge of a certain sin, he should not say. Nor should the embattled cleric be excommunicated, "because he is not subject to his superior, except as a man; this, however, he does not know as man, but as God."[147]

The priest's bifurcated knowledge as man and God became a standard defense of the seal among the theologically oriented pastoral manuals. Hence when John of Freiburg transmits the standard casuistic tropes—the prelate attempting to pry a confession out of a subordinate, a malicious judge inquiring about a crime, or an abbot who learns of one of his monks' abuse of office through confession—the same answer is repeated at regular intervals: the priest does not know as man, but as God.[148] Indeed, John likens the "judge who

maliciously harasses and inquires of the priest if he knows something of the case through confession or some other way" to a tyrant attempting to force another to idolatry or to the perpetration of a mortal sin, thereby casting the priest into the role of martyr.[149] This rationale even spreads to canonical circles, where it is optimistically embraced by Panormitanus to demonstrate that the seal of confession "is likewise proved by reason."[150]

Despite the gradual penetration of the inquisition into lay tribunals, the seal of confession would find no correlative in the secular world. Nor did secular authorities participate in the priest's quasi-divine function. In a certain sense, when Lateran IV outlawed the ordeal, it simultaneously stripped the secular world of its window into the human conscience, its ability to perceive guilt and innocence as God did, and reallocated it, in augmented form, to the priesthood alone. This priestly prerogative and the exclusivity of the seal, particularly when viewed in conjunction with the hypothetical scenario of a tyrannical secular judge attempting to pressure a priest into betraying the confession, seem to pit the two penal systems—ecclesiastical and secular—against one another. But if occasionally in opposition, the two systems were always proximate and usually complementary. Many sins were crimes as well, in which case penance and punishment might correspond closely. Even the fact that exculpation before the heavenly tribunal could lead to incrimination and punishment on earth could be construed as a sign that, for good or for ill, it was impossible to extricate sacramental confession from its secular counterpart.

The propinquity of overlapping tribunals is even more apparent with respect to sacramental confession and confession of heresy, thus rendering sacramental confession a potentially hazardous proposition, sometimes for the priest, but more often for the penitent—a realization that was hardly lost upon the laity. The epigraph from the Fournier register recounts a shepherd's flip contention that the only good of confession is the mirth it affords the priest and his cronies. While this comment could masquerade as simple irony, it is also consistent with a muted awareness of danger. There are numerous explicit testimonies in the same register where the fear of sacerdotal betrayal is no laughing matter. Individuals testified explicitly that they refrained from sacramental confession out of fear of denunciation.[151] This is what motivated the quasi-heretical priest Petrus Clericus of Montaillou (better known as Pierre Clergue, himself an informer against his erstwhile heretical friends) to urge his former lover Beatrix not to confess, assuring her that confession to God was sufficient. 152 Moreover, the seal could be subverted by any number of specious exceptions, as, for example, when several priests testified that a

suspected heretic merely feigned confession, never bothering to confess any sins at all when he ostensibly presented himself for this purpose.[153] But then such a performance was, arguably, not protected by the seal.

These apprehensions could never be entirely dispelled. But they could be mitigated with the right kind of promotion, one that made the strongest case possible for the spiritual benefits of the sacrament. Ideally, this impetus should come from the laity. Moreover, it should not merely justify the act of confessing but embrace the entire penitential system—including the agents responsible for the administration of penance in any of its many diverse forms. This propagandistic task would be assumed by women. As one might expect, however, the affirmation of penitential culture proved every bit as fluid as confession itself. Any endorsement of sacramental justice in penance would inevitably be shared not only with its antiheretical double but also with its secular counterpart.

[1] Constance, Session 15, arts. 9–11, Tanner, 1:422–23.

[2] See Stephen of Bourbon, *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues tirés nr recueil inédit d'Etienne de Bourbon*, ed. A. Lecoy de la Marche (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1877), no. 343, pp. 296, 297. Cf. the contritionist position of Abelard, which also challenged the necessity of oral confession (Paul Anciaux, *La Théologie nn sacrement de pénitence au XIIe si[egrave]cle*, Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis, ser. 2, vol. 4 [Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1949], pp. 176–207, 223–31). See Raymond of Peñafort's summary of these views in *Summa de poenitentia et matrimonio* 3.4.11 (Rome: Joannes Tallini, 1603), pp. 446–47.

[3] John of Pouilly's difficulties reflect tensions between secular priests and the mendicant orders, whose members he claimed had cast aspersions on him (Denifle, 2:245, no. 798, n. 2). For the process against John, see Joseph Koch, "Der Prozess gegen den Magister Johannes de Polliaco und seine Vorgeschichte (1312–1321)," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 5 (1933): 391–422. For John's clarification of his views and recantation, see Denifle, 2:245–46, no. 799. See J.M.M.H. Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), p. 174. John had been involved in his own set of condemnations, censuring Marguerite Porete's work as well as the subsequent heresy of the Free Spirit (see chap. 4, n. 208, below, and chap. 7, n. 19, below).

[4] Panormitanus, *Commentaria in quartum et quintum Decretalium Librum* (London: Cum privilegio regis Philippo Tinghio, 1586), vol. 3, fol. 256r, ad X.5.38.12, *Omnis utriusque* (= Lat. IV, c. 21). See, however, Pierre-Marie Gy's analysis of the theological tendency to assimilate Lateran IV with divine law ("Le précepte de la confession annuelle et la nécessitéde la confession," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et th é ologiques* 63 [1979]: 529–47).

[5] Lea, *Confession*, 1:171–89.

[6] Raymond of Peñafort implies divine origin in his interpretation of Christ's command "Do penance" (Matt. 4.17, see *Summa de poenitentia* 3.34.4, p. 448). Bonaventure posits that while Christ instituted the power of the keys—the formal part of the sacrament—he merely hinted at (*insinuavit*) the material part of the sacrament, confession, to the apostles, to whom it was left to institute (in *Commentaria in quatuor libros sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi* bk. 4, dist. 17,

pt. ii, art. 1, q. 3, resp., in *Opera omnia*, ed. Fathers of the College of Saint Bonaventure [Florence: College of Saint Bonaventure, 1898], 4:441 (hereafter cited as *Sent*.). Aquinas was the first to suggest divine authorization (*Scriptum super libros sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi* bk. 4, dist. 17, q. 3, art. 1, resp. ad 3, ed. Maria Fabianus Moos [Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1947], 4:371 (hereafter cited as *Sent*.). This view was disseminated in pastoral circles by Thomas's popularizers, such as John of Freiburg (see *Summa confessorum* bk. 3, tit. 34, q. 31 [Rome: n.p., 1518], fol. 187r). See Lea, *Confession*, 1:168–69, and Gy, "Le précept . . . et la nécessité," esp. pp. 536 ff.

7 See AndréDuval, "Le Concile de Trente et la confession," *La Maison-Dieu* 118 (1974): 131–59.

8 Lateran IV, c. 3, Tanner, 1:233–34.

9 ". . . speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transsubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem potestate divina," Lateran IV, c. 1, Tanner, 1:230.

10 Also note that the opening description of God's creation of angels as entirely spiritual (hence noncorporeal) was also an inflected response to the Cathar belief that humans were fallen angels who would eventually be redeemed. See Dyan Elliott, *Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), pp. 136–50.

11 Eventually Peter Lombard's list of sacraments would be adopted. See Innocent III's defense of Lombard against the criticism of Joachim of Fiore (Lateran IV, c. 1 and 2, Tanner, 1:231–32). Canons 51–52 attempt to make marriage less readily dissoluble (ibid., 1:257–59). Alan of Lille, born in the Midi, where Catharism loomed largest, and whose writings are seen as important precursors of Lateran IV, anticipates this line of defense. His *De fide catholica contra haereticos* (*PL* 210, cols. 305–430) is based on the doctrine of the sacraments, while his confessors' manual, *Liber poenitentialis* (between 1199 and 1203), constitutes a spirited defense of the sacrament of penance (ed. Jean Long[egrave]re, Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia, 17–18 [Louvain: Nauwelaerts; Lille: Librairie Giard, 1965]). Also see Raymonde Foreville's "Les statuts synodaux et le renouveau pastoral nn XIIIe si[egrave]cle dans le Midi de la France," *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 6 (1971): 136 ff. Cf. Annie Cazenave, "Aveu et Contrition: Manuels de confesseurs et interrogatoires d'inquisition en Languedoc et en Catalogne (XIIIe–XIVe si[egrave]cles)," in *La Piétépopulaire au Moyen Age*, Actes du 99e congre[egrave]s national des Sociétés Savantes, Besan ç on, 1974 (Paris: Biblioth[egrave]que Nationale, 1977), pp. 334–35.

12 Lateran IV, c. 21, Tanner, 1:245. In addition to circulation at various local councils, c. 21 would also be included in Gregory IX's *Decretals* as X.5.38.12, "De poenitentiis et remissionibus."

13 Pierre-Marie Gy resists the association of c. 21 and the detection of heresy ("Le précepte de la confession annuelle [Latran IV, c. 21] et la détection des hérétiques: S. Bonaventure et S. Thomas contre S. Raymond de Peñafort," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 58 [1974]: 444–50). Also see idem, "Les définitions de la confession apr[egrave]s le quatri[egrave]me concile du Latran," in *Aveu*, p. 286. Gy entertains this possibility in "Les bases de la pénitence moderne," *La Maison-Dieu* 117 (1974): 76. Longe`re, editor of Alan of Lille's *Liber poenitentialis*, just assumes that the purpose of attention to a stable confessional practice by Alan and Lateran IV alike was to discern heresy (introd., 1:224, 228).

14 Bonaventure, opusc. XIV, *Quare fratres minores praedicent et confessiones audiant*, in *Opera omnia*, 8:376.

15 Foreville assumes that the lists of nonconfessants were passed on to the

inquisition, but provides no evidence ("Statuts synodaux," p. 129).

16 This is frequent in the Fournier register. See p. 43, below in the present chapter.

17 See Gy, "Le precepte . . . et la détection," p. 445.

18 Lea cites Ulric of Augsburg (d. 973), who urged annual confession on Ash Wednesday (*Confession*, 1:194).

19 Nicole Bériou, "Autour de Latran IV (1215): la naissance de la confession moderne et sa diffusion," in *Pratiques de la confession: des P[egrave]res du d è sert [agrave] Vatican II. Quinze è tudes d'histoire*, Groupe de la Bussi[egrave]re (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1983), pp. 75, 80.

20 See Amédée Teetaert, *La Confession aux laïques dans l' è glise latine depuis le VIIIe jusqu'au XIVe si[egrave]cle* (Wetteren: J. de Meester; Bruges: Ch. Beyaert; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1926), pp. 85 ff. For the correlation between the penitential system and a focus on the individual, see Colin Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual, 1050–1200* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972). Cf. Pierre Legendre's assessment in "*De confessis*: remarques sur le statut de la parole dans la premi[egrave]re scholastique," in *Aveu*, p. 407.

21 Teetaert, *Confession*, p. 100.

22 The change is inaugurated by Aquinas, who particularly stresses the importance of the priest's absolution (Teetaert, *Confession*, pp. 272 ff.; also see n. 130, below).

23 Robert Blomme, *La Doctrine du p è che é dans les è coles th è ologiques de la premi[egrave]re moitie é du XIIe si[egrave]cle* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1958), pp. 161–62. Cf. Bériou, "Autour de Latran IV," pp. 76–79; Cazenave, "Aveu," p. 334.

24 Aquinas, *ST* 3a, q. 84, art. 3, 60:10–19; Gerson, *De forma absolvendi a peccatis*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:173.

25 Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, *An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1980), p. 58.

26 This conundrum would remain unsettled. See Angelo Carletti (d. 1495), *Summa angelica de casibus conscientialibus* (Venice: Iac. Sanouinum, 1569), ad *confessio sacramentalis*, no. 28, fol. 102r; cf. Pierre Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes de casuistique et manuels de confession du Moyen Age (XII–XVI si[egrave]cles)* (Louvain: Nauwelaerts; Lille: Librairie Giard, 1962), pp. 99–101.

27 There is disagreement as to when this sequence became common (Louis Braeckmans, *Confession et communion au Moyen Age et au Concile de Trente* [Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1971], pp. 10–12; Gy, "Les bases," pp. 73–74).

28 Bonaventure, *Quare fratres* c. 7, in *Opera omnia*, 8:376. Cf. Aquinas's quodlibet that queries whether a priest ought to believe his parishioner if the latter claims that he has confessed elsewhere (quodlib. 1, q. 6, art. 3 [12] *Opera omnia: Quaestiones de quolibet*, ed. Ordo Fratrum Praedicatorum [Rome: Commissio Leonina, 1996], 25,2:192–93; on this genre, see chap. 6, pp. 237–38, below); also see Braeckmans, *Confession*, pp. 14–15, 42–43, 46, 47.

29 Aquinas, *ST* 3a, q. 80, art. 4, resp., 59:44 ff. Cf. art. 5, 39:46–53. The priest should not deny a sinner the host, unless the sin is manifest (3a q. 80, art. 6, resp. and resp. ad 1, 59:54–55).

30 Trent, ann. 1551, session 13, c. 7, Tanner, 2:696; Braeckmans, *Confession*, p. 11. Many eminent confessors' manuals do not make this association (p. 72).

31 This shift was not immediate. See particularly Jacques Berlioz's analysis of exempla that use the ordeal to promote sacramental confession, in "Les ordalies dans les *exempla* de la confession," in *Aveu*, pp. 315–40. Cf. Jacques Chiffoleau, "Sur la pratique et la conjoncture de l'aveu judiciare en France du XIIIe au XVe si[egrave]cle," ibid., pp. 341, 343–47.

[32] Peter Brown, "Society and the Supernatural: A Medieval Change," in *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982), p. 307. For liturgical rituals of ordeal by cold water, see *Formulae Merowingici et Karolini Aevi: Ordines Iudiciorum Dei*, ed. Karl Zeumer, *MGH*, *Legum Sectio V. Formulae*, pp. 621–22. See H. C. Lea's discussion of the use of the eucharist in *Superstition and Force: Essays on the Wager of Law—the Wager of Battle—the Ordeal—Torture*, 4th ed. (Philadelphia: Lea Bros., 1892), pp. 344–51. Other forms of the ordeal likewise looked to divine providence in the midst of the quotidian workings of nature, such as the test of burning iron or boiling water. See *Formulae Merowingici*, *MGH*, *Legum Sectio V, Formulae*, pp. 604–17. The ritual ingestion of bread and cheese was also used to detect crimes like theft, the rationale being that the guilty party would choke on these appropriately consecrated morsels (ibid., pp. 629–36; see Lea, *Superstition*, pp. 300–382; Robert Bartlett, *Trial by Fire and Water: The Medieval Judicial Ordeal* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1986], pp. 4–33). See Peter Browe's interesting collection of primary sources describing actual instances of ordeals in *De Ordaliis*, 2 vols., Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, Textus et Documenta, nos. 4, 11 (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1932, 1933).

[33] For early criticisms, see Jean-Philippe Lévy, "La probl[egrave]me de la preuve dans les droits savants au Moyen Age," *Recueils de la Soci è te é de Jean Bodin* 17, 2 (1965): 141–43; Lea, *Superstition*, p. 395. Also see various theological and canonical objections, beginning in the late eleventh century (in Browe, *De Ordaliis*, 2:70 ff.). But for papally sponsored ordeals throughout the period of the Gregorian Reform, see Colin Morris, "*Judicium Dei*: The Social and Political Significance of the Ordeal in the Eleventh Century," in *Church Society and Politics*, ed. Derek Baker, Studies in Church History, vol. 12 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1975), pp. 95–111.

[34] See John Baldwin's "The Intellectual Preparation for the Canon of 1215 against Ordeals," *Speculum* 36 (1961): 613–36. For lay resistance to ordeals, see R. C. Van Caenegem, "La preuve dans l'ancien Belge des origines [agrave] la fin du XVIIIe si[egrave]cle," *Recueils de la Soci è te é de Jean Bodin* 17, 2 (1965): 386–89.

[35] Lateran IV, c. 18, Tanner, 1:244.

[36] Aquinas, *ST* 3a, q. 80, art. 6, resp. ad 3, 59:56–57. Aquinas is using the *Decretum* of Gratian (ca. 1140) (C. 2 q. 5 c. 20). But note Gratian's uncertainty as to whether this interdict pertains to all ordeals (dpc).

[37] Cf. Brown's discussion of transubstantiation in "Society and the Supernatural: A Medieval Change," in *Society and the Holy*, pp. 326–27.

[38] Lea, *Superstition*, pp. 344–51. Biblical passages are from the Douai-Reims translation of the Latin *Vulgate*.

[39] Aquinas, *ST* 3a, q. 79, art. 3, sed contra, 59:10–11; 3a q. 80, art. 4, sed contra and resp. ad 5, 59:42–43, 44–45. See Braeckmans, *Confession*, pp. 14–15.

[40] Lateran IV, c. 8, "De inquisitionibus," Tanner, 1:238. For the inclusion of these decrees in Gregory IX's *Decretals*, see X.3.12, c. un. (1198); X.5.34.10, X.5.3.31–32 (1199); X.5.1.21 (1212), culminating in Lateran IV (X.5.1.24). See Adhémar Esmein, *A History of Continental Criminal Procedure with Special Reference to France*, trans. John Simpson (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1913), p. 81.

[41] Esmein, *History of Continental Criminal Procedure*, pp. 9–10. Walter Ullmann points out that the medieval distortion of the accusatorial process, whereby the accuser is penalized if his/ her accusation is not sustained, facilitated the transition ("Some Medieval Principles of Criminal Procedure," *Juridical Review* 59 [1947]: 10–11).

[42] On the coincidence of the inquisitorial procedure, torture, and confession, see R. C. Van Caenegem, "Methods of Proof in Western Medieval Law," *Mededelingen van Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen Letteren en Schone Kunsten van Belgieï, Academiae Analecta* 45, 3 (1983): 113 ff.; Edward Peters, *Torture* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985), pp. 44 ff. Lea notes that ordeal and torture rarely coexist, canceling each other out (*Superstition*, p. 429; also see pp. 329, 426, 479 ff.). For a concise contrasting of the accusatorial versus the inquisitorial system, see Ullmann, "Some Medieval Principles," pp. 4–5. On the migration in meaning from "test" to "torture" in antiquity, see Page DuBois, *Torture and Truth* (New York: Routledge, 1991), pp. 9–34.

[43] Lea, *Confession*, 1:207 ff. For the impact of Peter the Chanter and his circle of theologians on Lateran IV, see John Baldwin, *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and His Circle* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1970), 1:315–43.

[44] See Gy, "Définitions," p. 285. Abelard strove to separate the concepts of penance and punishment in his definition of remorse (Cazenave, "Aveu," p. 334; Nicole Bériou, "La confession dans les écrits théologiques et pastoraux du XIIIe sie`cle: médication de l' â me ou démarche judiciare? " in *Aveu*, p. 276).

[45] Lateran IV, c. 21, Tanner, 1:245.

[46] See Bériou, "Confession," pp. 261–82.

[47] Peter of Poitiers, *Summa de confessione. Compilatio praesens* c. 46, ed. Jean Longe`re, *CCCM*, 51 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1980), pp. 57–58. Cf. Bériou, "Confession," pp. 271–72. Also see Lester K. Little, "Les techniques de la confession et la confession comme technique," in *Faire Croire*, pp. 94–95.

[48] For William of Auvergne's analogy of the priest as midwife, see *Tractatus novus de poenitentia* c. 16, in *Opera omnia* (Paris: A. Pralard, 1674; reprint, Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1963), 1:591 (cf. chap. 5, pp. 227–28, below); as a doctor, see *De sacramento poenitentiae* c. 2, ibid., 1:457; for the image of vomiting, see ibid., 1:465, 487. The *Tractatus novus de poenitentiae* was written ca. 1223, while *De sacramento poenitentiae* was written ca. 1228. Cf. Bériou, "Confession," pp. 268–69, 271–72. On William's contribution to the significance of the sacerdotal blessing and the distinction between attrition and contrition, see Paul Anciaux, "Le sacrement de pénitence chez Guillaume d'Auvergne," *Ephemerides Theologiae Lovaniensis* 24 (1948): 98–118. On William in general, see Noeïl Valois, *Guillaume d'Auvergne, ev ê que de Paris (1228–1249): sa vie et ses ouvrages* (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1880).

[49] William of Auvergne, *De sacramento poenitentiae* c. 3, in *Opera*, 1:460–61; cf. *Tractatus novus de poenitentiae*, where he outlines a similar plan (c. 1, in *Opera*, 1:571). Also see Bériou, "Confession," pp. 275–76.

[50] William of Auvergne, *De sacramentis* c. 3, in *Opera*, 1:461; cf. 486.

[51] Ibid. c. 2, in *Opera*, 1:458.

[52] See Bériou, "Confession," pp. 275–76; cf. Aquinas's affirmative answer to the question of whether a priest should believe a parishioner who claims to have confessed to another, which turns on a careful distinction between the two fora (quodlib. 1, q. 6, art. 3 [12], in *Opera omnia*, 25,2:192–93).

[53] William of Auvergne, *De sacramentis* c. 2, in *Opera*, 1:459.

[54] Cf. Bériou, "Confession," pp. 276–77.

[55] William of Auvergne, *De sacramento poenitentiae* c. 1, in *Opera*, 1:453. Cf. his commendation of self-abandonment to the judgment and torture by another (*De sacramento poenitentiae* c. 3, in*Opera*, 1:461).

[56] Cazenave, "Aveu," p. 337.

[57] On Raymond's career, see Amédée Teetaert, "La doctrine pénitentielle de Saint Raymond de Penyafort, O.P.," *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia* 5 (1929): 139

ff. Documents pertaining to his lifeand writings have been printed in *Raymundiana*, and in JoséRuis Serra, ed., *San Raimundo de Penyafort: Diplomatorio* (Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona, Facultad de Derecho, 1954). Also see the prologue by Manuel J. Pela è ez and JoséCalvo in Gonza è lez Fernando Valls Taberner, ed., *Literatura Juri è dica: Estudios de ciencia juri è da e historia del pensamiento cano è nica y politico catala è n, franca è n e italiano* (Barcelona: Promociones Publicaciones Universitarias, 1986).

58 On his entrance into the Dominicans, see *Raymundiana*, fasc. 6, 2, pp. 7–8.

59 On Raymond's resistance, see contemporary accounts by Humbert of Romans, John Colonna, and Nicholas Trevet (*Raymundiana*, fasc. 6, 1, pp. 2, 6, 8). Peter Marsilio, writing in the late thirteenth century, and Raymond's anonymous vita mention the papal excommunication (ibid., pp. 13, 24).

60 As master general, he redacted the Dominicans' constitutions, which were basically in use until the present century. A number of these revised ordinances pay special attention to sacramental confession within the community (Taberner, *Literatura Juri è dica* 1.14, p. 543; 1.18, p. 547; 1.20, p. 549).

61 For Raymond's commission, see *Raymundiana*, fasc. 6, 2, pp. 23–24. Also see Stephen Kuttner, "Raymond of Peñafort as Editor: the 'Decretales' and 'Constitutiones' of Gregory IX," *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law*, n.s., 12 (1982): 65–80; and Pela è ez and Calvo's prologue in Taberner, *Literatura Juri è dica*, pp. 83–87.

62 See Amédée Teetaert, "La *Summa de poenitentia* de Saint Raymond de Penyafort," *Ephemerides Theologiae Lovaniensis* 5 (1928): 60–62; Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes de casuistique*, pp. 34–42. The very contours of Raymond's manual were an essential impetus to the casuistic inquiries of Dominican theologians like Aquinas (Leonard Boyle, *The Setting of the "Summa Theologicae" of Saint Thomas*, Etienne Gilson series, 5 [Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1982], p. 6). Peter Marsilio claims that Aquinas wrote his *Summa against the Gentiles* at Raymond's request (*Raymundiana*, fasc. 6, 1, p. 12).

63 Raymond of Peñafort, *Summa de poenitentia*, preface, p. 1. On Raymond's introduction of the penitential forum, see Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes de casuistique*, p. 37; idem, "A propros des premi[egrave]res *Summae confessorum*," *Recherches de th è ologie ancienne et m è di è vale* 26 (1959): 305.

64 Raymond of Peñafort, *Summa de poenitentiae* 3.34.28, pp. 462–63. The excerpt is from Gratian, *de poen*. Dist. 6 c. 1.

65 "Quis, quid, ubi, per quos, quoties, cur, quomodo, quando / Quilibet obseruet, animae medicamina dando," *Summa de poenitentia* 3.34.29, p. 463. Note that the earliest *summae*, written around the time of Lateran IV, anticipate Raymond's use of interrogation. See Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes des casuistique*, pp. 21–24. Alan of Lille has a parallel verse: "quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando" (*Liber poenitentialis* bk. 1, prol., p. 15; cf. the section on the priest's interrogatories, 1.4, pp. 26–27). As Alan's editor, Long[egrave]re, points out, this line of inquiry is ultimately derived from Burchard of Worms's *Decretum* 20.8, *PL* 140, cols. 979–80.

66 See his discussion of the inquisitional process in the context of criminous clerics in *Summa de poenitentia* 3.31.2–5, pp. 364–67.

67 Raymond consolidated the important decrees on inquisitional procedure instituted by Innocent III and his successors. See n. 40, above; and Célestin Douais, *L'Inquisition: ses origines—sa proc è dure* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1906), pp. 6 ff.

68 Cf. an anonymous English manual (ca. 1400) intended for a penitent preparing him-or her-self for confession, concluding with a section *De*

inquisitionibus (*Tractus breuis: penitentibus tamen utilis. de modo confessionis. ac et inquisitionibus faciendis de peccatis*, Bodleian MS 555, fols. 110r ff.).

[69] For competing theories on the origins of the inquisition, see Douais, *L'Inquisition*, pp. 18 ff. Gregory IX's decretal *Ille humani generis* (1232), addressed to the Dominicans at Regensberg regarding the organization of (translated in *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe*, ed. Edward Peters [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980], pp. 196–98). Note, however, that the term "inquisition" does not signify a coherent, freestanding institution, since tribunals were organized on a local level. See the introduction, n. 1, above.

[70] This is not immediately apparent in his assemblage of the *Decretals*. Title 7 of book 5, *On Heretics*, contains recent papal sanctions levied against heretics but does not associate the method of their persecution with the inquisitional procedure. Similarly, the section treating heretics in his confessors' manual is preoccupied with enunciating punishments (Raymond of Peñafort, *Summa de poenitentia* 1.5, esp. c. 1–9, pp. 38–44).

[71] For an overview of his activities, see Taberner, *Literatura Juri è dica*, pp. 111–17.

[72] For instance, the question is raised of whether a person should continue to speak or cohabit with a heretical spouse (*Raymundiana*, fasc. 6, 2, pp. 32–33). Cf. his consultation of 1235 with the archbishop of Tarragona, where he discusses the question of heretical spouses again (ibid.,fasc. 6, 2, p. 42).

[73] See ibid., fasc. 6, 1, p. 12. Peter Marsilio was also an intimate counselor of the king, which further endorses his report. For Gregory's bull to the archbishop of Tarragona, see ibid., fasc. 6, 2, pp. 14–16, and pp. 16–17, n. 2. King James's constitutional initiatives against heresy are reproduced in ibid., fasc. 6, 2, pp. 39–40 n. 2. Also see Célestin Douais, "Saint Raymond de Peñafort et les hérétiques: Directoire a` l'usage des inquisiteurs aragonais, 1242," *Le Moyen Age* 12 (1899): 313.

[74] See Raymond's anonymous life, in *Raymundiana*, fasc. 6, 1, p. 24. The bishop in question was removed from office in 1237, however (ibid., fasc. 6, 2, pp. 61–62).

[75] See ibid., fasc. 6, 2, pp. 41–44. He already presumes the possible presence of an "Inquisitor a Sede Apostolica constitutus" (p. 42).

[76] Raymond of Peñafort, "Directoire [agrave] l'usage des inquisiteurs aragonais," in Douais, *L'Inquisition*, pp. 275–88. This was first edited by Douais in his "Saint Raymond de Peñafort et les hérétiques," pp. 315–25. Although this document does not circulate under Raymond's name, the preface states very clearly that it was the result of conversations with him (ibid., p. 312); also see Douais's historical notes in ibid., pp. 305–6, 312–15. Cf. Antoine Dondaine, "Le manuel de l' inquisiteur(1230–1330)," *AFP* 17 (1947): 96–97; Cazenave, "Aveu," see p. 337; Edward Peters, *Inquisition* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), pp. 63, 76. The protomanual is included under the Council of Tarragona for 1242, in Mansi, vol. 23, cols. 553–58. See Peters's translation in *Heresy and Authority*, pp. 198–99.

[77] Cazenave, "Aveu," esp. pp. 333, 335, 337, 347.

[78] *Raymundiana*, fasc. 6, 2, p. 43. Note that this was a relatively generous reading from the perspective of the incriminated penitent. The Council of Narbonne of 1243 (or possibly 1244) says tentatively that a confessor should not be believed with regard to the absolution from penance of either the dead or the living. The council deferred to the pope on this difficult question, however, and claimed to be awaiting his response (see Mansi, vol. 23, col. 363, c. 28; note that the incorrect date of 1233 appears).

79 "Directoire," in Douais, *L'Inquisition*, p. 279.

80 Ibid., p. 284. See Gy's "Le précepte . . . et la détection," pp. 446 ff.

81 Raymond compiled this work in case "some brothers of our order, or others, were in doubt about the judgment of souls in the penitential forum," *Summa de poenitentia*, preface, p. 1.

82 Ibid. 3.34.59, pp. 489–90; cf. Lat. IV, c. 21, Tanner, 1: 245. As noted above, Raymond included this canon in the *Decretals* (X.5.38.12). But he leads off with the warning of Gregory the Great as transcribed by Gratian (*de poen.* Dist. 6 c. 2) that a priest revealing a confession would be deposed and relegated to a life of ignominious wandering.

83 Raymond of Peñafort, *Summa de poenitentia* 3.34.60, pp. 490–91. This contradicts Raymond's general view that one should not denounce someone for a hidden crime already committed (ibid., 1.9.3, pp. 89 ff.).

84 Ibid. 3.34.60, pp. 490–91.

85 Ibid. 1.5.10, p. 44.

86 This initiative was taken at the Council of Tarragona of 1279. It was not acted on until the fourteenth century, however. See the process of 1318 and 1321 in Serra, *San Raimundo de Penyafort*, pp. 205–65.

87 *Raymundiana*, fasc. 6, 1, p. 24. Under the rubric "De disciplinis et afflictione corporis," however, there is only one feeble sentence, *Raymundiana*, fasc. 6, 1, p. 30.

88 Ibid., p. 23.

89 Ibid., pp. 22, 23.

90 Ibid., pp. 25–26. Appended to this miracle, within the hagiographal text itself, moreover, is a legal probate of the miracle by two priests.

91 Stephen of Salagnac's account is preserved amid the documents collected for Raymund's canonization (ibid., fasc. 6, 2, pp. 75–76).

92 Gui's account is an excerpt from his *De tribus gradibus prelatorum*, written between 1300 and 1304, in *Raymundiana*, fasc. 6, 1, p. 9; also see n. 1. He apparently had access to Stephen of Salagnac's account (see ibid., fasc. 6, 2, p. 76 n. 1). Note the interesting Latinization of Raymund's place of origin as "Poena forti" or "Strong Punishment" in Gui's life of Gregory IX (*RIS*, 3,1:571).

93 The life does, however, mention his zeal in converting Jews and Saracens (*Raymundiana*, fasc. 6, 1, pp. 31–32).

94 For efforts toward Raymond's canonization, see AndréVauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*, trans. Jean Birrell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 81–82; idem, *BS*, vol. 11, col. 22. See Michael Goodich's "The Politics of Canonization in the Thirteenth Century: Lay and Mendicant Saints," in *Saints and Their Cults*, ed. Stephen Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 79.

95 Jean Duvernoy, ed., *Le Registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier, è v ê que de Pamiers (1318–1325)* (Toulouse: E. Privat, 1965), Petrus Maurinus, 3:229. The witness is reporting what the heretics commonly said. In the interest of clarity, I have retained the Latin names for individuals in inquisitional records.

96 See Raymond of Peñafort, *Summa de poenitentia* 3.34.59, p. 489; Aquinas, *Sent*. bk. 4, dist.

21, q. 1, sed contra, 4:1068. Also see Bonaventure, *Sent*. bk. 4, dist. 21, pt. 2, art. 2, q. 1 ad 2, 4:565–66.

97 Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum* 3.32, ed. Joseph Strange (Cologne, Bonn, Brussels: J. M. Heberle, 1851), 1:49; trans. H. Von E. Scott and C. C. Swinton Bland, *Dialogue on Miracles* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929), 1:168.

98 *An Alphabet of Tales: An English Fifteenth Century Translation of the*

Alphabetum narrationum, ed. M. M. Banks, *EETS*, o.s., no. 126, pt. 1 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1904), no. 179, p. 126 (probably by fourteenth-century Arnold of Li[egrave]ge). Caesarius is cited.

99 Bernard Gui's *Liber sententiarum inquisitionis Tholosanae*, printed as an appendix in Philippus von Limborch's *Historia inquisitionis cui subjungitur Liber sententiarum inquisitionis Tholosanae* (Amsterdam: Henricus Wetstenium, 1692), p. 251. Cf. Arnaldus de Vernhola, who posed as a confessor—partially to pursue his homosexual seductions (Duvernoy, *Le Registre*, 3:14–50). See John Arnold's deployment of Judith Butler's performative framework in analyzing Arnauldus's sexuality (*Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001], pp. 214–25).

100 On the relation between preaching and hearing confession, see particularly Roberto Rusconi, "De la prédication a` la confession: transmission et contr ô le de mod[egrave]les de comportement au XIIIe si[egrave]cle," in *Faire Croire*, pp. 67–85; Little, "Les techniques de la confession," in ibid., pp. 88–89; and Jacques Berlioz, " 'Quand dire c'est faire dire': exempla et confession chez Etienne de Bourbon (d. v. 1261)," in ibid., pp. 299–335.

101 Conrad Eubel, ed., *Bullarii Franciscani epitome: sive Summa bullarum in eiusdem bullarii quattuor prioribus tomis relatorum addito supplemento* (Florence: College of Saint Bonaventure, 1908), Reate, 29 July 1234, p. 232; see Donato Soliman, *Il ministero della confessione nella legislazione dei Frati Minori*, Studi e testi Francescani, no. 28 (Rome: Edizione Francescane, 1964), p. 41. Eventually, the general chapter of the Franciscans would attempt to secure the strict observance of the seal. See Paris 1292 under rubric 6 ("De occupationibus fratrum") c. 4, c–d, Michael Bihl, ed. "Statuta Generalia Ordinis edita in capitulis generalibus celebratis Narbonae an. 1260, Assisii an. 1279 atque Parisiis an. 1292. Editio critica et synoptica. Index specialis," *AFH* 34 (1941): 75; cf. Soliman, *Il ministero*, pp. 157 ff.

102 See Mark Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels: The Great Inquisition of 1245–1246* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001), p. 67.

103 James of Vitry, *The Exempla or Illustrative Stories from the Sermones Vulgares of Jacques de Vitry*, ed. Thomas Frederick Crane, Folk-Lore Society Publications, 26 (London: Folk-Lore Society, 1878; reprint, Nedeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus, 1878), no. 80, p. 36. They are probably mendicants, because they are called "preachers," and they were in the area to preach and hear confession.

104 See *De apibus* 2.30.3, p. 321; 2.30.4, p. 321; 2.30.9, p. 324; 2.30.55, p. 359; 2.55.2, p.532, etc.

105 Ibid. 2.30.6, p. 322.

106 Ibid. 2.30.48, p. 354.

107 Cited by Antoninus of Florence, *Confessionale Anthonini* 3.29 (Paris: Jehan Petit, 1507?), fol. 38r. Colverner, editor of *De apibus*, aware of the problem, is nevertheless at pains to justify any possible indiscretion of Thomas (notes for 2.30.3, p. 91 at the end). On Antoninus, see Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes de casuistique*, pp. 73–75.

108 Jean Gobi, *La Scala coeli*, ed. Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1991), no. 260, p. 275.

109 See, for example, Bonaventure, *Quare fratres* c. 15, 19, in *Opera omnia*, 8:379, 381. This information also makes its way into confessors' manuals. See John Nider's *Confessionale seu manuale confessorum fratris Johannis Nyder ad instructionem spiritualem pastorum valde necessarium* (Paris: Jehan Petit, n.d.), 2.1 (unpaginated).

[110] Bonaventure also envisages instances of a person intent on marrying someone, despite the existence of a hidden affinity, or of a prior who confesses a sin to the abbot that will persist as long as the prior retains his position of responsibility (*Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, art. 2, q. 1, ad contra, 2–4, 4:566). Aquinas, familiar with Bonaventure's *Sentences*, raises the same hypothetical cases (*Sent.* bk. 4, q. 3, art. 1, ad 1, 4:1067–68). See Gy, "Le précepte . . . et la détection," pp. 448–49.

[111] Bonaventure, *Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, art. 2, q. 1, resp. ad 2, 4:566–67.

[112] Ibid. resp., 4:566–67.

[113] Aquinas, *Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, q. 3, art. 1, resp. ad 1, 4:1069; cf. his comment "concealment is the essence of the sacrament," art. 2, resp., ibid., 4:1072.

[114] Here he compares revealing a confession with an attempt to consecrate elements entirely different from bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ, either offense constituting a sacrilege. "The effect, moreover, of penance is the hiding of sins from the eyes of the punishing [*punientis*] God; and this hiding is signified in the secrecy of confession," Aquinas, quodlib. 12, q. 10, art. 2 [17], in *Opera omnia*, 25,2:411. Unfortunately Thomas's quodlibet 12, which raises the question of the seal of confession, is incomplete (Leonard Boyle, "The Quodlibets of St. Thomas and Pastoral Care," in *Pastoral Care, Clerical Education and Canon Law, 1200–1400* [London: Variorum, 1981], II, p. 236).

[115] Aquinas, *Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, q. 3, art. 1, resp. ad q. 1 ad 1, 4:1070.

[116] Ibid. resp. ad 2, 4:1070; Gy, "Le précepte . . . et la nécessité," pp. 537 ff.

[117] See Leonard Boyle, "The *Summa confessorum* of John of Freiburg and the Popularization of the Moral Teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas and Some of His Contemporaries," in *Pastoral Care*, III, esp. pp. 249–58. For dating, see III, pp. 248–49. Michaud-Quantin suggests that John may even have been a student of Thomas (*Sommes de casuistique*, pp. 43–48).

[118] John of Freiburg, *Summa confessorum* bk. 3, tit. 34., q. 91, fol. 194r.

[119] Carletti, who upholds the integrity of the seal, includes the opposing view of Innocent IV and others, who argue that, if one really wants to do something evil, this is not part of the penitential forum and hence not protected (*Summa angelica*, ad *confessio ultimo VIII* nos. 1–4, fols. 115v–16r; 7, no. 3, fol. 116v).

[120] Mansi, vol. 23, col. 363, c. 28; cf. Lorenzo Paolini, ed., *Il "De officio inquisitionis": La procedura inquisitoriale a Bologna e a Ferrara nel Trecento* (Bologna: Editrice Universitaria Bolognina, 1976), bk. 2, p. 80; and Zanchino Ugolini, *Tractatus de haereticis* c. 34, in *Tractatus universi iuris*, ed. Camillo Campeggi (Venice: Franciscus Zilettus, 1584), vol. 11, pt. 2, fol. 264r. This prohibition seems to have been lifted after the person is dead, however, as Gui provides a form for summoning the confessor in the defense of his dead penitent (Gui, *Practica inquisitionis hereticae*, ed. Célestin Douais [Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1886], 1.26, p. 23).

[121] Bonaventure, *Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, pt. 2, art. 2, q. 2, 4:567–68; Aquinas, *Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, q. 3, art. 2, sed contra et resp., 4:1072. Note, however, that both stress sensitivity to scandal.

[122] Bonaventure, *Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, pt. 2, art. 2, q. 3, contra ad oppositum 3–5, 4:569.

[123] Ibid. contra ad 5, and resp. ad opinio 1, 4:569–70. He thinks this is an extremely dangerous position, as does Aquinas (*Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, q. 3, art. 3, resp., 4:1074).

[124] Bonaventure, *Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, pt. 2, art. 2, q. 3, resp. ad 5, 4:571; cf.

Aquinas, *Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, q. 3, art. 3, resp., 4:1073–74.

[125] Aquinas, *Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, q. 3, art. 1, ad 2, 2 and resp. 2, ad 2, 4:1068–69, 1071. Cf. Bonaventure, *Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, pt. 2, art. 2, q. 3, resp. ad 5, 4:571.

[126] Cf. Palémon Glorieux's indexes for the Parisian masters between 1260 and 1320 in *La Litte è rature quodlib è tique de 1260 [agrave] 1320*, 2 vols. (vol. 1: Le Saulchoir, Kain: Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques, 1925; vol. 2: Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1935). Twenty-three different masters addressed the seal, while a number of these (most notably Henry of Ghent, Nicolas Trivet, and Thomas Aquinas) returned to this subject on several occasions.

[127] Boyle, "The Quodlibets of St. Thomas," in *Pastoral Care*, II, pp. 240 ff.; Glorieux, *Litt è rature quodlib è tique*, 1:24.

[128] Henry of Ghent, quodlib. 7, q. 26, *Henrici a Gandava: Quodlibet VII*, ed. G. A. Wilson, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 11 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991), p. 237; Glorieux, *Litt è rature quodlib è tique*, 1:87–94, 177).

[129] Henry of Ghent, quodlib. 8, q. 29, *M. Henrici a Gandava . . . Quodlibeta* (Venice: Jacobus de Franciscus, 1613), 2:51. The abbot is unable to report the situation to his superior since his knowledge came from confession alone, where he knows as God, not man. And yet as confessor, and hence "secretary of God," the abbot can resolve in secret to move his sinful penitent, though he ought to provide a separate reason to the public. Cf. Bonaventure, *Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, pt. 2, q. 1, ad oppositum 4, and resp. ad 4, 4:566, 567, and Aquinas, quodlib. 5, q. 7, art. 1 [13], in *Opera omnia*, 25,2:378–79. James of Viterbo challenges the distinction between knowing as God and knowing as man, arguing that in a strict sense, only Christ can know as both man and God (*Jacobi de Viterbio O. E. S. A. Disputatio secunda de Quolibet*, ed. Eelcko Ypma [Würzburg: Augustinus, 1969], p. 231). On James, see Glorieux, *Litt è rature quodlib è tique*, 1:214–15.

[130] Godefroid of Fontaines, *Les Quodlibets onze–quatorze de Godefroid de Fontaines*, ed. J. Hoffmans (Louvain: Editions de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, 1932), quodlib. 12.18, vol. 5, fasc. 1–2, pp. 137–39. Cf. Aquinas's similar conclusion (*Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, q. 3, art. 1, resp. ad 3, 4:1071), and its reiteration by John of Freiburg (*Summa confessorum* bk. 3, tit. 34, q. 97, fol. 194r–v). On Godefroid, see Glorieux, *Litt è rature quodlib è tique*, 1:149–51. Lay confession disappeared largely as a result of Aquinas's intervention. See particularly quodlib. 12, q. 10, art., 1 [16] in *Opera omnia*, 25,2:411, and n. 22, above.

[131] Carletti, *Summa angelica*, ad *confessio ultimo VIII*, fols. 116r–17r.

[132] Ibid. no. 6, fol. 118r. Here Carletti relies on Bonaventure. The distinction between the seal of secrecy and the seal of confession is common to other manuals as well. See John of Freiburg, *Summa confessorum* bk. 3, tit. 34, q. 96 and q. 98, fols. 194r, 194v; Antoninus of Florence, *Confessionale* c. 28, fol. 37v; cf. Antoninus's discussion of a criminal pressured by a judge to give his confessor permission to reveal a confession (c. 27, fol. 36r). Henry of Ghent argues against the obligation of a religious subordinate, bound by secrecy, to reveal something to his abbot under obedience—provided no one is at risk (quodlib. 9, q. 27, in *Henrici a Gandavo: Quodlibet IX*, ed. R. Macken, in *Opera omnia*, 13:312. Cf. Aquinas, quodlib. 4, q. 8, art. 1 [12], in *Opera omnia*, 25,2:332.

[133] Some, however, such as Bartholomeus of Pisa, writing ca. 1338, attempt to circumvent the controversy by only reiterating the conclusions of

Bonaventure (et al.), suppressing the alternative view (*Summa de casibus conscience secundum compilacionem Bartholomei*, ad *confessionis celacio*, Bodleian MS, 736, fol. 26v; see Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes de casuistique*, pp. 60–62).

134 Antoninus of Florence, *Confessionale* c. 27, fol. 26r; cf. Bonaventure, *Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, p. 2, art. 2, q. 2, contra ad 1, 4:567.

135 See Aquinas, *ST* 2a, 2ae q. 10, art. 3, resp., 32:46–49, and art. 6, resp., 32:56–57; quodlib. 10, q. 7, art. 1 [15], resp., in *Opera omnia*, 25,1:145–46.

136 Aquinas, *ST* 2a 2ae, q. 11, art. 3, resp. and ad 3, 32:88–91. He is quoting from Gratian's citation of Jerome (C. 24 q. 3 c. 16); cf. 2a 2ae q. 11, art. 4, resp. and ad 1, 32:92–95. Also see Aquinas's citation of the *Glossa ordinaria* in this context for Matt. 13.30 (quodlib. 10, q. 7, art. 1 [15], resp. ad 2, in *Opera omnia*, 25,1:146).

137 Bartholomeus of Pisa, *Summa de casibus*, ad *accusare*, fol. 5r. John of Freiburg, citing Hostiensis, notes that if a priest disclosing a confession is unable to prove that he has learned of a sin through another route, he must be punished (*Summa confessorum* bk. 3, tit. 34, q. 99, fol. 194v).

138 In the question "Is fraternal correction a matter of precept?" Aquinas uses as his turning point a citation from Augustine: "By failing to correct a sinner you become worse than he is" (*ST* 2a 2ae, q. 33, art. 2, 34:278–83). Also see "De correctione fraterna," quaest. disput. un., art. 1 in *Quaestiones disputatae*, ed. P. Bazzi et al., 8th rev. ed. (Turin and Rome: Maretti, 1949), 2:793–94. Cf. his negative resolution to the quodlibetal question "Whether someone who knows the sin of his neighbor sins mortally by reporting it immediately to his prelate," quodlib. 11, q. 10, art. 2 [13], in *Opera omnia* 25,1:170–71. For an alternative perspective, see Raymond of Peñafort, *Summa de poenitentiae* 1.9.3, pp. 89–90; William of Rennes, ibid. gloss t, ad v. *Committenda*, p. 90. Also see n. 142, below.

139 Carletti, *Summa angelica*, ad *confessio delicti*, fol. 96v.

140 See Raymond of Peñafort, *Summa de poenitentia* 1.9.1, p. 80; John of Freiburg, *Summa confessorum* bk. 1, tit. 9, q. 1, fol. 25v. Also see his discussion of perjury, bk. 1, tit. 9, q. 20 and q. 22, fol. 27v.

141 Raymond of Peñafort raises the very extreme case of an oath's being extorted in captivity. Though Raymond grudgingly grants that one can be released from the oath, the individual does not entirely escape sin (*Summa de poenitentia* 1.9.3, pp. 87–88); cf. William of Rennes, ibid., gloss m. ad v. *Bene potest*, p. 88.

142 Raymond of Peñafort, *Summa de poenitentia* 1.9.3, pp. 88–89; cf. John of Freiburg, *Summa confessorum* bk. 1, tit. 9, q. 31, fol. 28v. William of Rennes posits, however, that if a lord or jealous husband makes his household or retainers swear in advance that they will tell him of any subsequent offenses perpetrated against his property (including his wife), this is not binding (*Summa de poenitentia* 1.9, gloss r ad v. *Qui compulsus*, p. 88). Cf. John of Freiburg's adaptation of the question involving the scenario of the lord making his household swear (*Summa confessorum* bk. 1, tit. 9, q. 31, fols. 28v–29r).

143 Bonaventure, *Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, art. 2, q. 1, resp., 4:566. This exemplum was popularized by James of Vitry (*Exempla*, no. 302, pp. 126–27). Cf. the bull *Animarum salutem* regarding the Franciscan order's ministry of confession, in which Gregory IX describes the individual confessor as "a second God" (Soliman, *Il ministero*, p. 148).

144 Bonaventure, *Sent.* bk. 4, dist. 21, pt. 2, art. 2, q. 1, contra ad 1, and resp. ad 1, 4:566. This formula is repeated often in his treatment of the seal. See, for example, bk. 4, dist. 21, pt. 2, art. 2, q. 2, resp., 4:568; bk. 4, dist. 21, pt. 2, art. 2, q. 3, ad oppositum 3, and ad contra 3, 4:568, 569.

145 Ibid. q. 1, resp. ad 1, 4:566.

146 Cf. Aquinas, *ST* 2a 2ae, q. 70, art. 1, resp. ad 2, 38:130–31.

147 Aquinas, *Sent*. bk. 4, dist. 21, q. 3, art. 1, resp. ad 2, 4:1070; cf. ibid., ad 3, sed contra, 4:1069; bk. 4, dist. 21, q. 3, art. 2, resp., 4:1072; art. 3, ad 3 and resp. ad 3, 4:1073, 1074 (bis); *ST* 2a 2ae, q. 70, art. 1, resp. ad 2, 38:130–31.

148 John of Freiburg, *Summa confessorum* bk. 3, tit. 34, q. 91, q. 92, q. 94, fol. 194r. Cf. Antoninus of Florence, *Confessionale* c. 26, c. 27, fols. 35r–v, 36r–v; Carletti, *Summa angelica*, ad *confessio ultimo VIII* no. 4, fol. 116r.

149 John of Freiburg, *Summa confessorum* bk. 3, tit. 34, q. 92, fol. 194r.

150 Panormitanus, Commentaria ad X.38.12, no. 7, fol. 254v.

151 Duvernoy, *Le Registre*, Ramunda Testaniera, 1:458, 461.

152 Ibid., Beatrix de Ecclesia, 1:234.

153 This was said by a number of priests, testifying against Arnaldus Textoris (ibid., 2:196, 197–98, 200).

PART 1

Women as Proof of Orthodoxy

Chapter Two

The Beguines: A Sponsored Emergence

> In truth, every confession occasions a revelation that cannot exist without the revelation of one and the perception of another.
>
> (Antoninus of Florence, *Confessionale*)[1]
>
> You said to me that you were filled with wonder bycertain women who wept more for a single venial in than the men of your land wept over a thousandmortal sins.
>
> (James of Vitry, *The Life of Mary of Oignies*)[2]

AS FAR AS CLERICS LIKE James of Vitry were concerned, the holy lay-women of the Low Countries who came to be known as Beguines were just what was needed for the church's promotional requirements. Of course, this view was not shared by all. That the very development of the Beguine movement was attended by currents of negativity is clearly attested by James of Vitry's prologue to the life Mary of Oignies—who was one of the earliest and certainly the most famous of the Beguines.[3] Over the course of the fourteenth century the situation would worsen: indeed, all manner of female religious life would gradually fall prey to attacks at the hands of diverse orthodox forces. And yet this well-known eventuality should not eclipse the fact that the dramatic emergence of female spirituality in the first half of the thirteenth century was part of a clerically sponsored program. This sponsorship was apparent at the highest level. Although better known for his patronage of Francis of Assisi (d. 1226), Gregory IX—the very pope under whom the inquisition took shape—also abetted the efforts of the pious women's more immediate supporters. Indeed, both the early Beguine movement and the cult of Elisabeth of Hungary were, as we shall see, fostered by Gregory.

The Beguine movement is often described as arising spontaneously in the Low Countries.[4] Whether or not this is actually the case, the active sponsorship of certain holy women associated with the Beguine movement by clerics such as James of Vitry was an extension of the antiheretical campaign associated with Lateran IV. In the writings of these men, female piety comes to exemplify devotion to the sacraments, particularly confession and the eucharist, and further demonstrates the proper devotion due to the clergy.Women, as quintessential laypersons barred from ordination and locked in an enduring position of deferential subordination, were particularly suited for modeling the proper attitude to the clergy. A clear nexus may be discerned in the various strands of female sacramentalism.

Female attachment to the sacrament of penance presumably existed in a kind of symbiosis with eucharistic piety—an association that can be read as a part of a united program insofar as Canon 21 of Lateran IV was increasingly understood to mandate confession as a precondition for the reception of the eucharist.[5]

Particularly striking, moreover, is the way that female piety was realized within the confessional relationship. Lateran IV had ostensibly constituted every Christian layperson in a stable and personal relationship with a specific confessor. The full extent of the relational aspect of the sacrament is especially apparent in the pronouncements of Antoninus of Florence cited above: confession demands one speaking and one apprehending. 6 Indeed, so deeply ingrained were the roles of speaker and auditor that a frequent quodlibetal question posed was whether a confession was valid if it was written rather than spoken.[7] The relational quality of the sacrament of penance leaves an indelible mark on the lives of holy women in the High and later Middle Ages. Not only is confession represented as the frequent venue for the discussion of a woman's spirituality, including the disclosure of revelations, but the confessor himself becomes chief witness to his individual penitent's piety, which will frequently lead him to undertake the writing of a saintly woman's vita and the promotion of her posthumous cult.

Women's confessional exemplarity extends far beyond the mere instances of confession and absolution or even personal devotion to an individual confessor. As we will see with respect to the Beguine mystics in particular, much of the intensity of their spiritual lives is linked to their penitential service for individuals in purgatory. Indeed, the holy women's poignant visions of the dead or extensive suffrages on behalf of the denizens of purgatory associate the act of confessing with the theological infrastructure by which it is sustained.

JAMES OF VITRY, THOMAS OF CANTIMPRÉ , AND THE BEGUINE MILIEU:

NEW CONFESSORS FOR NEW CONFESSOR SAINTS

For there must be also heresies: that they

also, who are approved [*sunt probati*] should be manifested among you.

(1 Cor. 11.19)

The natural starting point for any discussion of female sanctity in the High Middle Ages is James of Vitry's landmark life of Mary of Oignies

—the first life of a female mystic that became a model for most subsequent spiritual biographies.[8] First learning about Mary when he was in Paris completing his studies in theology, James was drawn to Li[egrave]ge by her reputation for sanctity, where he soon became her confessor and ultimate interpreter to the world. Written shortly after her death in 1213, the vita was widely disseminated in the wake of Lateran IV.

Mary's life has rightly been dubbed by AndréVauchez an "antiheretical manifesto."[9] The work was dedicated to the exiled bishop Fulk of Toulouse, who had been routed from his see by Cathar heretics. He came north to preach the Crusade against his heretical flock, alongside men like James, and returned at the head of an army.[10] Thus the prologue to the life of Mary upholds the holy women of Li[egrave]ge as a powerful antidote to heretical infidelity. Indeed, the very selection of women as holy paradigms bristles with a clear antiheretical impetus. From the perspective of the dualist Cathars, women, by virtue of their association with childbearing and the flesh, were seen as a lower form of incarnation. A pregnant woman was seen as a particular harbinger of evil and was accordingly even barred from the Cathar sacrament of *consolamentum*.[11] The fact that Mary was married at all, and that the institution itself was treated by James as a holy one, insulated the sacrament from heretical slander.[12] Vauchez further emphasizes how Mary, having lived a number of years in a spiritual marriage with her husband, exemplified an intramarital chastity that outstripped even the impressive sexual abstinence of the Perfect—the Cathar clergy.[13] Likewise, her rigorous fasting and apostolic poverty served as an orthodox counter to the much admired asceticism of heretics. Scholars such as CarolineWalker Bynum have similarly noted the polemical import of the Beguines' eucharistic devotion.[14] The prologue to the life of Mary describes entire communities of swooning women, whose longing for the host was so great that "unless their souls were frequently invigorated by the delights of this meal, they obtained no consolation or rest but utterly wasted away in languor. Let the heretic infidels be ashamed who receive the delights of this food neither in the heart nor with faith."[15] Indeed, the apparent synchronization of the early Beguine movement with the rise of Catharism is a perfect enactment of Paul's grim sense of the necessity of heresy in manifesting those who have been proven.

The Beguinal relationship with the sacrament of penance was no less avid than their eucharistic devotion. The prologue reports that Fulk was astonished at the way many Beguines would weep more for a single venial sin than the men of his own country would have wept for a thousand mortal sins.[16] Mary exemplified this heightened sense of her own sinfulness, despite James of Vitry's conviction that she had

never committed a mortal sin.

> If sometimes it seemed to her that she had committed a little venial sin, she showed herself to the priest with such sorrow of heart, with such timidity and shame and with such contrition that she was often forced to shout like a woman giving birth from her intense anxiety of heart. Although she guarded herself against small and venial sins, she frequently could not discover for a fortnight even one disordered thought in her heart. Since it is a habit of good minds to recognize a sin where there is none, she frequently flew to the feet of priests and made her confession, all the while accusing herself and we could barely restrain [ourselves] from smiling when she remembered something she had idly said in her youth.[17]

Every vespers, Mary would carefully search her day's activities to ascertain that they had been properly regulated, before proceeding to make a fearful confession. According to James, the various clerics in the community could themselves discover no real faults in Mary's behavior: "in this alone we sometimes reprimanded her, seeking consolation for our own sloth, because she would confess these small sins we mentioned above more frequently than we would have wished."[18] Mary's confessional practices far outstripped the bare requirements of Lateran IV, anticipating the recommendation for daily confession that would be advanced by authorities like Raymond of PeÑafort.[19]

Intrinsic to Mary's confessional habits were her arduous feats of penance and satisfaction. According to James she "immolated her body with marvellous penance for the lord . . . and with great love and marvellous delectation, embracing the Cross of Christ, she was crucified in the flesh."[20] Mary's relative sinlessness did not impede the fervor of her penance: once she brought to mind (*ad memoriam reduceret*) how she had eaten meat and drunk some watered wine to counteract illness. So disgusted was she by this past indulgence that she "compensated marvellously with a torturing [*cruciatu*] of her flesh," cutting off a large chunk from her side. James knew of this instance of Mary's excessive self-mortification through confession. But the wounds on her cadaver were also apparent to the women who prepared the body for interment.[21]

Mary's sense of unworthiness, the urgency of her need to confess, and the apparent relief confession brought were linked with her intense devotion for the priesthood, an indispensable trait at a time of heretical anti-clericalism. In the same section in which he discusses her confession, James describes how a pious impulse would prompt

her to kiss the hands or feet of priests.[22] But this exemplary devotion was not reserved exclusively for Mary's confessors: she was also drawn to visiting preachers—so much so, in fact, that she would clutch at their feet, kiss them even when they were unwilling, and weep when they attempted to leave.[23]

If James of Vitry sculpted the confessional practices of the Beguines into an antiheretical polemic, Thomas of Cantimpré, an ardent admirer of James, developed this polemic into a far-reaching penitential program. And this is in keeping with the profiles of their respective careers. James had been a famous preacher, whose preaching had, in fact, catalyzed Thomas's own vocational development.[24] But as is suggested by the prominent role James played in preaching the Crusade against the Albigensians and the "infidel" of the Holy Land, he also had an interest in the wider world of ecclesiastical politics.[25] Consecrated bishop of Acre in 1216, James would eventually resign this post, returning to Li[egrave]ge as an auxiliary bishop from 1226 to 1229. But he soon left this position of semiretirement, summoned to Rome by his friend the former Hugolino of Ostia, who had now ascended the papal throne as Gregory IX. James's departure for Rome occurred against the protests of his clerical friends from Li[egrave]ge. According to Thomas of Cantimpré's testimony, James was even prepared to brook the supernatural displeasure of his now deceased holy penitent, Mary of Oignies, who had appeared to James in a dream to express her dislike of the Roman plan.[26] James was subsequently made cardinal and bishop of Tusculanum (modern-day Frascati), ending his days in Rome.

In contrast, Thomas of Cantimpré's ambitions do not seem to have extended far beyond his role as preacher and pastor of souls—responsibilities to which he attempted to recall James in the supplement he wrote to the life of Mary of Oignies.[27] Thomas's religious vocation was predetermined before birth, occasioned by a penance imposed on his father. The latter had been told he could not possibly do the requisite penance in his lifetime, but that he should dedicate any son he might have to the priesthood so the son could pray on his father's behalf.[28] Beginning his religious career in a community of Augustinian Canons at Cantimprébefore joining the Dominicans around 1232, Thomas rose no higher than the rank of subprior of his community of Louvain. But his experience as a confessor was considerable and varied. Hearing confessions on behalf of the various bishops of Cambrai for over thirty years, Thomas would be privy not only to every coloration of the average garden-variety sin but also to a number of reserved sins—sins that were considered sufficiently unusual or grave that their perpetrators were referred to

the higher episcopal tribunal for absolution.[29] Thomas's writings were frequently peppered with unusual anecdotes bearing on this experience.

In addition to his supplement to the life of Mary, Thomas wrote three hagiographies of holy women from the Li[egrave]ge area: the lives of two lay ascetics, Christina of Saint Trond (alias Mirabilis, d. 1224) and Margaret of Ypres (d. 1237), and the life of the Cistercian nun Lutgard of Aywi[egrave]res (d. 1246). The latter work would especially resonate with Thomas's heart-strings since he regarded Lutgard as his spiritual mentor.[30] Finally, there was Thomas's work *Concerning Bees*, which was completed in 1263. 31 Over the course of these works, Thomas presented the holy women of Li[egrave]ge, in conjunction with his pastoral experience, as vehicles to explore the many different dimensions of the confessional experience in the broadest sense, spanning this world and the next.

The life of Margaret of Ypres relied on the testimony of her confessor, the Dominican Friar Zeger, for its information. Its main focus is on the hierarchical relationship between a confessor and his penitent, emphasizing the benefits of submitting to the discipline of the confessional relationship. 32 In so doing, it serves as an implicit refutation of the heretical contention that confession to God alone suffices. Indeed, Margaret's religious vocation is directly indebted to the general mandate to confess, beginning with a timely meeting with her future confessor and spiritual director in the course of a general call to confession in the parish church of Lille.[33] Looking at the many women waiting to confess, Friar Zeger immediately recognized Margaret as a "vessel of election" (Acts 9.15) and besought her to reject secular life, advice that she instantly took to heart.[34]

Considering the pivotal role that confession and a meeting with her confessor played in Margaret's spiritual life, it is not surprising to learn that she shared in Mary of Oignies's commendable, if occasionally exasperating, confessional scrupulosity. Although, like Mary, Margaret had never actually committed a mortal sin, she nonetheless "always accounted herself the worst and most wicked sinner as if she had committed an infinite number of mortal sins." Margaret's extravagant grief over her sense of sinfulness was to some extent assuaged by the reassurance of Christ's forgiveness through a vision of the Virgin Mary.[35] And yet Margaret was forever backsliding into the depths of scrupulous terror over largely imaginary sins. For instance, once while suspended in spiritual ecstasy Margaret had necessarily been prevented from observing the appropriate canonical hours. Manifesting the most excessive grief, she immediately sought out her confessor who, observing his distraught penitent, became, in turn, excessively alarmed. Zeger's alarm soon gave way to extreme

annoyance, however, when he learned the true reason for her distress: " 'Leave! . . . Get out of my sight, O most miserable woman! You have made me shake and have left me almost senseless from anguish.' "[36] Margaret weathered rebuffs such as these, continuing to look to Friar Zeger for reassurance, and suffering torments when he was out of town and unavailable to allay her scruples.[37]

The spirituality of many of the Beguine mystics was indebted to the kind of Bernardine nuptial imagery associated with Cistercian circles. Thus Mary of Oignies and Lutgard of Aywie`res, for example, are frequently referred to as Christ's spouse. Margaret of Ypres's relationship with her confessor, however, introduces a different dimension to nuptial allegory. At the time of her conversion, Margaret was recalled from the brink of carnal love at the behest of Friar Zeger, who could be construed as something of a stand-in for the celestial spouse, Christ. Not only does Margaret's subordination to Zeger closely parallel the prescribed submission of the wife, but it is accompanied by a similar transfer of affect. As a result of the very intensity of Margaret's relationship with Friar Zeger, a scruple of a different order naturally began to assert itself. Margaret recognized that she loved her spiritual father "more than anybody or anything she had in the world," but began to worry that this might impede her relation with Christ—especially since "mutual love and frequent conversation between a man and a woman seem suspicious to our superiors." Fortunately, Christ reassured her that she had nothing to fear from her intimacy with Friar Zeger.[38] In view of Margaret's divinely endorsed dependency, her exemplary piety was often expressed in terms of obedience to her confessor, a virtue that vied with her raptures and revelations as proof of her sanctity. This level of obedience is represented as transcending death. Thus Zeger sends an ailing woman to Margaret's grave with the following message: " 'Go and tell my daughter who has just died that she should obey me as she did when she was alive, and that she should ask the Lord to cure you.' "[39]

While the life of Margaret emphasizes the fruits that the penitent might reap through due submission to the confessor, the life of Lutgard emphasizes the spiritual rewards that would accrue to the clerics who were fortunate enough to sponsor such holy women, effecting the quid pro quo exchange between confessor and female penitent described so lucidly in the work of John Coakley.[40] Lutgard, a nun in the Cistercian community of Aywie`res, fulfilled a symbolic function for Thomas similar to the one that Mary of Oignies fulfilled for James of Vitry. Both clerics perceived their respective holy women as their spiritual mothers.[41] But the two relationships were hardly commensurate in degree of intimacy, since Thomas was neither

Lutgard's confessor nor her closest clerical confidant. This role was reserved for a certain Bernard, another member of the Dominican order, whom Thomas tells us was also papal penitentiary and confessor to the pope—a fact that furthers the case for the papacy's ongoing interest in the women of this area. It was to Bernard that Lutgard "revealed all these secrets of her heart." And it was to Bernard that Thomas turned for many details of Lutgard's life.[42]

Yet Bernard does not seem to have furnished much information concerning the circumstances of Lutgard's no doubt exemplary confessional life, or if he did, Thomas is showing uncharacteristic reserve. Instead, Lutgard is deployed as a resource for resolving the difficulties that surround the sacrament of penance. Thomas himself was a particular beneficiary of Lutgard's abilities in this area. As a young man, before he had left the Augustinian Canons to enter the Dominican order, Thomas reports that he was prematurely assigned a position in the episcopal penitentiary to hear confessions. The kinds of sins he was required to hear were the source of considerable consternation and temptation, a problem frequently addressed in confessors' manuals. When Thomas revealed the source of his agitation, Lutgard listened sympathetically before withdrawing into prayer. Thus fortified, she urged Thomas to return to his pastoral responsibilities, assuring him that " 'Christ will be present to you as protector and teacher and He will powerfully snatch you from the attacks of the enemy in the hearing of Confession and will add a greater grace to make up for the defect of knowledge which you fear.' " From that time onward, Thomas was rendered miraculously unmoved, even when compelled to listen to the most unclean sins. This blessed imperviousness was not limited to confession, moreover, but remained with him at all times.[43] Lutgard distinguished herself as penitential troubleshooter for other members of the clergy as well.[44] Perhaps it was in recognition of parallel instances of pastoral solicitude that the onetime master general of the Dominicans Jordan of Saxony made Lutgard mother and nourisher of the entire order.[45]

It is no exaggeration to say that in the course of the hagiographical writings of James of Vitry and Thomas of Cantimpré, a new kind of saint begins to emerge—one whose sanctity not only is revealed in but even develops through her evolving relation with her confessor, thus infusing the ancient concept of confessor saint with something of a double entendre. The appearance of the new confessor saint was contingent upon the new role of the confessor.

THE NEW MARTYRS FOR NEW TIMES: THE CULT OF THE LIVING DEAD

Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints. O Lord, for I am thy servant: I am thy servant. (Ps. 115.15–16)

> *O Lord, for I am thy servant*: They call themselves *servants* and children of the church because there is no place for true sacrifice outside the catholic church, lest a heretic imagine that his martyrdom is pleasing to God.
>
> (*Glossa ordinaria* for Ps. 115.16)[46]

The confessional protocol that James and Thomas established in the course of their writings was preliminary to a much larger penitential program. Both writers strove to affirm certain contentions about the afterlife that were denied by Cathars and Waldensians alike. In particular, the existence of purgatory and the ability of the living to ameliorate the condition of the dead were at issue. Heretical incredulity applied pressure on both sides of the orthodox equation: if the living were powerless to affect the lot of the dead, the saints (who orthodoxy maintained were already admitted to God's presence) were likewise powerless to work miracles on behalf of the living. Thus skepticism about the efficacy of prayers to the saints as well as about the cult of relics naturally ensued.[47] The lives of these women would serve as vigorous refutations of heretical disaffection, boldly mapping the perilous paths of communication between the differnt registers available to souls. In so doing, female spirituality simultaneously upheld the orthodox position on the afterlife and defended the prerogatives of divine justice.

But the first stage of this struggle was to reclaim the rhetoric of martyrdom for orthodoxy. The heretical rejection of the cult of the saints did not undercut the potent cultural capital implicit in suffering persecution for one's faith.[48] The Albigensian Crusade of 1208 was followed up by a series of systematic military and inquisitional campaigns.[49] Naturally the victims of these attacks would construct their own losses in terms of martyrdom. 50 Thus when Dominican inquisitor Stephen of Bourbon (d. 1261) is instructing his reader on how to recognize heretics, the first thing he mentions is their "usurpation of what is not owed to them." In addition to their appropriation of preaching and teaching of sacred doctrine, a potentially more serious transgression ensues:

> They would affirm that they were the blessed poor, as well as the meek and martyrs, suffering tribulation, and that the clerics persecuted them from jealousy, just as formerly the prophets of Jews [were persecuted], and the scribes and Pharisees persecuted the Lord and his disciples; and they, as they say, are the ones concerning whom the Lord says, "Behold I send to you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them you will put to death" (Matt. 13.34).[51]

Similarly,William of Newburgh (d. 1201) reports how the early Cathars, attempting to enter England and brutally rebuffed, appropriated the teaching “Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice’s sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven” (Matt. 5.10).[52] It did not help the orthodox case, moreover, that many of the clergy had themselves begun to associate a willingness for martyrdom with heresy. Ralph of Coggeshall recounts how a young woman burned for heresy astonished onlookers by her silent endurance on the pyre “like a martyr of Christ.” He hastens to add that “people of this wicked sect choose to die rather than be converted from error; but they have nothing in common with the constancy and steadfastness of martyrs for Christ, since it is piety which brings contempt for death to the latter, to the former it is hardness of heart.”[53] Likewise, when Raymond du Fauga, Fulk’s successor as bishop of Toulouse, visited the bedside of a dying Cathar believer in the hope of exposing her heresy, it was her expressed willingness for martyrdom that allegedly gave her away.[54] Naturally, there was a different standard among religious, particularly inquisitors, where a readiness for martyrdom was not considered suspect. According to William Pelhisson (d. ca. 1268), the prior of his community reported joyfully that four of them were assured martyrdom if they were prepared to undertake a particularly dangerous mission. When the friars were asked to express their readiness through prostration, the entire community allegedly prostrated themselves. Neither William, one of the chosen, nor his three companions were martyred, however.[55]

The laity, who were inclined to credit martyrdom to anyone who suffered an unjust death, were deeply moved by the courageous deaths of many heretics.[56] Orthodox authorities did what they could to offset the specter of the heretical martyr. There were, after all, a number of inquisitors put to death by heretics who would undoubtedly qualify for the palm of martyrdom.[57] Why not promote them? The answer is simple: the church did its best to advance their cults, but to no avail. Thus the relics of Peter of Castro (d. 1208), a kind of protoinquisitor whose murder in Languedoc provided impetus for the Albigensian Crusade, failed to work miracles—a failure that Innocent III attributed to the incredulity of the local populace.[58] The Dominican order were similarly foiled in their attempts to promote the cult of inquisitor Martin Donadieu (d. 1299)—a failure similarly blamed on the unworthiness of the people of Carcassonne. 59 The handful of inquisitors and their staff who were massacred in 1242 at Avignonet, an episode that met with rejoicing amid the heretically sympathetic countryside, failed to stimulate a process of canonization. 60 The single instance of an inquisitor’s achieving the official status of martyr was the case of Peter of Verona (d. 1252), known as “Peter

Martyr," a Dominican inquisitor who was killed by heretics outside the city of Como in Lombardy.[61] And yet it is surely significant that Peter became an inquisitor only late in life and was better known to the public for his charity, virtues, and public debates with heretics. In fact, it was these aspects of his life alone that were emphasized by the clerics who preached on behalf of his sanctity, probably hoping to obscure Peter's inquisitional affiliation.[62] And it is especially suggestive that not only was the church very slow to prosecute Peter's known assassins, but one was even converted to the Dominican order and eventually honored as a saint unofficially63—factors that betray a degree of ambivalence, to say the least. In addition to all these qualifications, the singularity of Peter's elevation should again be underscored. The numerous inquisitors who met similar fates at the hands of their heretical adversaries over several hundred years received no parallel recognition from the papacy. In fact, as AndréVauchez has noted, the category of martyr would become moribund by the end of the Middle Ages.[64]

Unable to come up with viable orthodox alternatives, the ecclesiastical authorities cast about for other methods of discrediting heretical martyrs. The theologian William of Auvergne, for example, asks explicitly why heretics often prefer their error to their lives and, what appears to be even greater madness, willingly embrace death with every semblance of joy. He can only conclude that they are demonically possessed.[65] Inquisitor Stephen of Bourbon would turn to the exemplum tradition to make his point. Differing with William's observation of the exultant heretical death, Stephen will argue that heretics do not die with the joy of martyrs but with their eyes cast down in sorrow (which indicated to one wise man that the heretics realized that they would never rise to heaven). Unlike most human flesh, which, according to Stephen, smells rather good when burned, heretics give forth a disgusting stench. Instead of healing, their "pseudorelics" actually blinded an individual in search of a cure for an eye infection.[66] Caesarius of Heisterbach's strategy was to expose ostensible incidents of heretical bravery as fraudulent: certain heretics of Besan- ç on, who reputedly worked dramatic miracles like walking on water or passing through fire unscathed, were enabled by the indentures that the devil had sewn into their arms. The bishop had the amulets removed (unfortunately he stooped to consulting a necromancer in order to uncover the heretical ruse), and suddenly the heretics became panicstricken when confronted by the hitherto friendly fire. The mob threw them into the flames and they perished.[67]

The bravado implicit in such orthodox disparagement should not be taken at face value. The clergy continued to be exceedingly anxious about heretical claims of martyrdom—an anxiety that would, as we

shall see, play a role in transforming orthodoxy's own profile of sanctity. James of Vitry's retaliatory initiative on behalf of orthodoxy is at the forefront of this change. First, James foregrounds the holiness of the war against the Albigensians throughout Mary's vita. Mary of Oignies is cast as the recipient of a vision anticipating the Albigensian Crusade, wherein its "holy martyrs" are ushered directly into heaven, bypassing purgatory. This vision was portentous enough to merit inclusion in contemporary chronicles treating the Albigensian Crusade. Mary also longs to make a pilgrimage to the south of France: " 'there I would honour my Lord by witnessing His name where so many impious men have denied him through blasphemy.' "[68] AndréVauchez has particularly emphasized the way James attempted to pit female asceticism against the awesome rigors of the Cathar Perfect.[69] In fact, James's daring reaches beyond this already ambitious program. He actually attempts to advance his holy women as types of martyrs whose self-imposed sufferings would be sufficiently compelling to eclipse the drama of heretical burnings altogether.

This initiative was grounded in the deflection from literal martyrdom already afoot in the early church. Even in the third century, Cyprian had distinguished between the two kinds of martyrdom: a red martyrdom signified the kind of persecution that eventuated in death, while a white martyrdom was associated with purity (particularly virginity) and ascetical inner suffering. This recognition of substitute forms of martyrdom would become especially widespread with the triumph of Christianity in the West.[70] The distinct modes of martyrdom came to be associated with flowers: red roses for external martyrdom versus white lilies for internal martyrdom.[71] The two frequently went together: hence a virgin martyr like Cecilia would be rewarded with roses and lilies. But with the conversion of the West, white martyrdom frequently had to stand alone. Gregory the Great (d. 604) distinguishes between a literal public martyrdom and the secret martyrdom that is effected "whenever the soul is eager and ready for suffering even if there is no open persecution." Similarly, Gregory stipulates that "the confessors of Christ served as persecutors of themselves and applied the various tortures of abstinence."[72] In the High Middle Ages, Thomas Becket (d. 1170) would be generally presumed to have satisfied the criteria for both red and white martyrdom—a happy concurrence since, according to Caesarius of Heisterbach, certain Parisian masters were disinclined to credit Becket with the title of martyr as he was not perceived as having died for the faith.[73]

Building on past tradition, James and his hagiographical successors press the very limits of self-mortification so that the distinction

between the red and the white martyrdom dissolves, even as the boundaries between the living and the dead give way. In so doing, they invite the super-natural to advance into contemporary life in an unprecedented manner, thereby transforming conceptions of sanctity forever.[74] Thus when Mary of Oignies punished herself for a remembered sin by hacking away a piece from the side of her body, the severe pain she endured actually induced a mystical ecstasy in which Mary understood herself to be standing beside a seraph.[75] Indeed, Mary's ascetical efforts, generally, were depicted as so extreme as to provoke supernatural reactions: either divine reward or diabolical interference. These acts of self-mortification are, moreover, framed within the larger context of James's prologue, which is particularly replete with the rhetoric of persecution. The Beguines are repeatedly described as being under constant attack by hostile critics.[76] Their chastity and even their lives are represented as at risk from the troops of the duke of Brabant during the sack of Li[egrave]ge in 1212. A number of the Beguines jumped into rivers or even sewers, choosing a malodorous martyrdom over physical defilement.[77]

Miraculously, not one of these women drowned. Nor were the Beguine mystics portrayed as dying from their austerities. Had they deliberately hastened their own deaths, they would have died in mortal sin and, thus, as excommunicates who would not even be permitted burial in consecrated ground. These women were not dying, but the heretics were. Thomas of Cantimpré, who was prepared to leave nothing to chance, insisted on spelling out precisely how the terms of orthodox martyrdom were transformed in the present age, lest the ones who literally suffered death be construed as the real martyrs. He thus asserts orthodoxy's claims by the strategy of symbolic substitution—an effect we can see at work in a repeated image in the lives of both Margaret of Ypres and Lutgard of Aywi[egrave]res. At the time of her conversion, Margaret was recalled from the brink of carnal marriage as a result of Friar Zeger's intervention. Soon after her death, she appeared to one of her friends in a crystalline body with a red stain at the breast. Smiling, she spoke to him with words evoking those of Saint Agnes, a virgin martyr and one of the most famous of the early church's many spurners of marriage: " 'Behold, what I have desired, I now see; what I hoped for, I now possess.' " When interpreting Margaret's appearance, Thomas alludes to the appropriate admixture of red and white in terms of the traditional symbols of martyred virgins: roses standing for blood and lilies for virginity. However, Thomas makes a subtle adjustment: while the white lilies still refer to virginity, the red roses designate her love for Christ.[78]

Such subtle allusions become more insistent in the life of Lutgard.

Like Margaret, Lutgard had been enamored of a young man but was released from this worldly attachment by a vision of the crucified Christ. Some time later, a noble matron prophesied that she would be a second Agnes. When her young man approached soon after this prophecy, Lutgard rejected him in the exact terms in which Agnes had rejected her importunate suitor.[79] Furthermore, once embarked upon the religious life, Lutgard began to long for martyrdom: "But because the time of martyrdom had passed like the winter and the rains had come and gone (Cant. 2.11), Christ prepared for her another kind of martyrdom." On a particular night after compline, when her desire to be martyred "like the most blessed Agnes" had reached a new level of urgency, a large vein in her breast burst, causing considerable blood loss. Christ immediately appeared to assure Lutgard that her fervent wish for martyrdom had been granted: she had earned the same merit of martyrdom as had Agnes in the course of her passion. Thomas then alludes to this fulfillment of the matron's prophecy and goes on to celebrate Lutgard's reception of "the crown of martyrdom in this time of peace."[80]

The question "Peace for whom?" quivers uneasily in the air. This seemingly innocuous characterization is, in fact, ferocious in its uncompromising negations. For the first half of the thirteenth century was especially marked by a series of unforgettable mass executions that characterized the harsh summary justice of the early heretical trials.[81] In particular, the Cathar stronghold of Montsé gur, besieged for many months by a large crusading army in retaliation for the massacre at Avignonet, finally fell in March of 1244. More than two hundred Cathars, many of them members of the Perfect elite who refused to renounce their faith, were burned in a massive enclosure of poles and stakes where, according to chronicler William of Puylaurens, they "passed over to the fire of hell."Written in 1246, Thomas's elegiac assertion that "the time of martyrdom had passed" and his characterization of the era as a "time of peace" use Lutgard's symbolic martyrdom to efface the empirical evidence of heretical counterclaims.[82]

But perhaps Thomas's most ambitious attempt to realign the rhetoric of martyrdom with contemporary penitential devotion occurs in the final chapter of the first book of *Concerning Bees*. Beginning with the exemplary behavior of bees and their alleged fatal mourning over the death of their "king," Thomas reflects unfavorably on humanity's detachment over the death of parents, something that he interprets as a corruption of nature.[83] In contrast, Thomas upholds the age of the martyrs, when individuals would gladly shed their own blood for their "father" Christ, while Christ, in keeping with Ps. 115.15, cited at the beginning of this section, rejoiced in their death.[84] The subsequent

exhortation to die on behalf of Christ is followed by four powerful exempla.[85] A man from Dinan visited the Holy Land in 1216. When he reached Calvary, his very empathy for Christ's passion burst the veins in his heart and he died.[86] The second tale concerns a certain Dominican from Strasbourg who had always piously crossed himself over his breast with his thumb. After his death, his breastbone, in conjunction with two of his ribs, was revealed to contain an image of a cross decorated by lilies—a marvel that Thomas saw with his own eyes.[87] (The lilies are, of course, representative of how white martyrdom can vie with the red through its dramatic physical effects.) The third episode concerns a woman from Brabant who, as a result of her profound meditations on Christ's passion, developed a huge wound in her side—a fact to which many trustworthy Dominicans attested. Some of the blood that had issued from the wound was preserved in a vial that Thomas had himself seen. Nor had the liquid corrupted in any way.[88]

Although the first three of these incidents are carefully situated in time and place, the fourth is less exact and could be construed as something of an adaptation of the martyrdom of Saint Ignatius (d. ca. 107). A pious Christian "around our own time" was the captive of a pagan tyrant. When asked by his master why he was always so mournful, the Christian responded that he grieved for his Lord's death and carried the signs (*stigmata*) of his passion in his heart. When Ignatius had made a similar statement to his executioner, the literal truth of his claim was proved subsequent to his martyrdom by an autopsy. Thomas offers a vigorous reconceptualization of the motif insofar as the claim itself occasions the martyrdom. The incredulous tyrant not only ripped open his servant's breast but had his heart cut in two, only to find an impression of the crucified Christ. This miracle precipitated the conversion of the tyrant and his followers.[89]

The basic strategy at work in these tales is to substitute instances of miraculous somatism so that devotion and love for God perform the function that had traditionally been assigned to the tyrant's delegated torturer in the lives of early martyrs. Thus Thomas is, in a sense, replicating the substitution that was explained in Margaret's life and effected in Lutgard's, wherein the roses, hitherto representing martyrdom, came to symbolize love. His masterstroke, however, is to retain a tyrant who effects a literal martyrdom and thus becomes the agent through whom the spontaneous and self-imposed martyrdom is revealed. This decision is symbolically and structurally salient. As the final episode in book 1, the story resonates with the last episode of book 2, which concerns a martyrdom of a very different stripe. A heretic, fleeing from inquisitors, pretends that he is a demoniac in order to conceal his identity—a ruse that a number of clerics claim to

be rather common among heretics.[90] While he is hiding out in a church, allegedly awaiting a cure, a fellow demoniac, who happens to be a cleric, covers him with straw and burns him.[91] This resolution turns on the heretic's misrecognition, which gives rise to the truth—a situation paralleling the familiar tale of the appointment in Samarra. A man sees Death making a threatening gesture at him in a market in Baghdad and rides to Samarra to escape his doom. But it turns out that Death's gesture was merely an expression of surprise at seeing the man in Baghdad since they had an appointment that evening in Samarra. In both stories, efforts to escape death are indeed complicit with the inexorable workings of divine justice, alternately meted out by the figure of Death or the figure of the possessed cleric.[92]

The contrasts between the tale of orthodox martyrdom that ends book 1 and the heretical martyrdom of book 2 are striking. Unlike the anonymous Christian martyr whose unspecified locale imparts a kind of timelessness, the heretical counterpart is rendered with the exactitude of an inquisitional record: the heretic was named Aegidius (Giles) Boogris, literally "the Bugger"—a derogatory term for heretic; he lived near Cambrai; the inquisition was being conducted by the Dominicans; he hid in the church of Saint Aicradus (who had a reputation for casting out demons) in the city of Asper, which was subjected to Cambrai.[93] Indeed, this level of detail has permitted Charles Homer Haskins to speculate that the anecdote might belong to the purge of Cambrai in 1235 by the infamous Dominican inquisitor Robert le Bougre (likewise "the Bugger," himself a reformed heretic).[94] In contrast to the Christian of book 1, who, wounded by virtue of his commemorative grieving and his faith, experiences a double martyrdom, the heretic of book 2 endures a double exposure as a sham. While the fidelity of the Christian's devotion is fittingly revealed by a pagan ruler, in keeping with the martyrs of the early church, the infidelity of the heretic is just as fittingly disclosed and punished by an avenging cleric, in keeping with rising inquisitional practice. Moreover, from a theological perspective, the heretic never had a legitimate claim to the title of martyr, for, as the epigraph from the *Glossa ordinaria* makes clear, "there is no place for true sacrifice outside the catholic church." This view is resoundingly seconded by authorities like Aquinas, who explicitly denies that a heretic's steadfastness in his or her beliefs could be an act of faith.[95] To William of Auvergne, the very joy with which heretics met death is a kind of dementia.[96] But the heretic described in *Concerning Bees* was not afflicted in this way, and his cowardly ruse forfeits even the simulacrum of a dignified death. And with this inverted martyrdom, *Concerning Bees* comes to a close.

Female spirituality in the High Middle Ages would evolve along the

subtle contours of displacement or reappropriation of heretical claims outlined by James of Vitry and, especially, Thomas of Cantimpré. Through their often voluntary pain and suffering, women would effectively become living martyrs who, by virtue of this anomalous state, already had a foothold in the hereafter. Their honorary role as living dead was enacted in a number of dramatic ways. As the work of Caroline Walker Bynum suggests, there was a very real sense in which these women were relics before their time.[97] The representations of Thomas of Cantimpreé make an especially strong case for the precociously cultic status of these women: the blood from the side of the nameless holy woman of *Concerning Bees* was saved, and presumably venerated, during her lifetime; Mary of Oignies obligingly yanked out a hunk of her hair to cure a friend; Lutgard oozed oil from her fingertips and, as we have seen, experienced a miraculous flow of blood.[98] Furthermore, in keeping with the model of the mystical biography of Mary by James of Vitry, all of the women discussed by Thomas were the recipients of ecstasies or raptures—a condition that generally effected a degree of immovability and insensibility that had much in common with death.[99] Although saints had always, in a certain sense, been "dead to the world," this was a much more literal assumption of the status of the dead by the living. Moreover, hagiographical tradition evinced any number of instances wherein the bodies of the holy dead had continued to exhibit signs of animation, as, for instance, a freedom from bodily corruption or signs of rejuvenation in complexion.[100] Although such miracles are not lacking in Thomas's works,[101] what is especially striking are his attempts to reverse this predictable topos. Thus holy living bodies simulate the kinds of marvels and miraculous imperviousness associated with the remains of the holy dead, blurring the boundaries between the two conditions.

In addition to advancing these women's spooky status as animated relics, James and Thomas are also eager to consolidate their tentative hold on sanctity by anticipating their death and their bodies' instantaneous accession to the status of more conventional relics.[102] In so doing, the women would transcend the inevitable procedural delays that would be imposed by the new requirement of papal canonization introduced by Lateran IV. This very projection beyond official approval was doubtless intended to act as a self-fulfilling prophecy that would entirely forestall sticky questions of papal ratification. We know from the celebrated letter of James of Vitry in which he describes his encounters with various contemporary religious movements that he had kept a finger of the deceased Mary of Oignies as a relic.[103] Thomas additionally reports that James lent Mary's finger to Hugolino of Ostia before the latter had ascended the papal

throne as Gregory IX. The relic had the desired effect of freeing Gregory from the spirit of blasphemy, which had led him to the brink of apostasy.[104]

But Thomas's intense fervor also leads him into an entirely different register of enthusiasm, in which he anticipates an individual's future value as relic while the person is still alive. Thus Thomas, perhaps unconsciously desiring to outdo James's custody of a mere finger of the latter's spiritual mother, Mary of Oignies, privately negotiates with the abbess of Aywie`res to have Lutgard's hand after she has died. When Lutgard hears of this, she is depicted as surprised and not entirely pleased. Calling Thomas to her side, she tells him he cannot have the entire hand, but only the little finger of her right hand, which he does eventually obtain. A vigorous defense of an individual's right to garner relics *of the recent dead* then ensues. But although Thomas begins with the early instance of Natalia's almost instant appropriation of the arm of her martyred husband, Adrian, it is contemporary examples that really arrest his interest: James of Vitry took possession of Mary's finger, which, in turn, benefited Gregory IX. Likewise, zealous supporters allegedly cut off the index finger of Elisabeth of Hungary the moment she died.[105] Thomas further reports that the value of Mary of Oignies's cadaver was eagerly calculated during her lifetime. When Mary reproaches Prior Giles for knocking out the teeth of a recently deceased holy person, and Giles responds with the teasing assurance he will do the same to her when she dies, the saint correctly predicts that she will thwart his efforts by shutting her jaw tightly after her death.[106]

The preoccupation with living women as relics refuted heretical skepticism with a vengeance. This refutation represented much more than a simple reaffirmation of the cult of saints; it constituted a vigorous reappropriation of some of the power of martyrdom that had gone over to the heretics who, like the martyrs of the early church, suffered cruel death at the hands of hardened executioners. Martyrs, orthodox or heretical, share this space with their classical prototype, Antigone. But there is an interim stage prior to death that is potentially more powerful still. As psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan has suggested, from the moment that Antigone defied the law by attempting the burial of her brothers, her life was forfeit and she was essentially a dead woman. Antigone thus assumes a position that Lacan has characterized as "between two deaths," wherein, although still physically alive, she is dead to the symbolic order. The manner of Antigone's death is but an enactment of her indeterminate state: she is immured in a tomb while she is still alive.[107]

Heretical defiance in the face of the church's strictures was a corridor to that nebulous zone that existed between two deaths: the

interim spanning condemnation and execution. It was during this ephemeral period that the heretic's courage captured the imagination of the laity. The somatic spirituality of orthodox women allowed them to inhabit this zone on a more permanent basis. Their disintegrating bodies kept them suspended between life and death. Moreover, so compelling a simulation of death in life was accompanied by the daring, but tacit, contention that these women were not just symbolically dead but were as good as dead—as efficacious and potent as the saints who had already departed this life. The theological implications of this position were staggering. It will be seen below that these women were depicted as possessing an ability to work miracles and a power to intervene beneficently in the spiritual destinies of both the living and the dead. This impressive intermediary role seemed to suggest a precocious but constant access to God's presence—a privilege traditionally reserved for the holy (and wholly) dead. Therefore, the women who constituted this elite corps were being presented as already worthy of veneration during their lifetimes. Their formidable intermediary function, their status as living relics in the present, and the anticipation of their cadavers as traditional relics in the future all served as vehicles for affirming the attainment of a kind of realized eschatology.

Such claims, unvoiced yet adamant, seem to fly in the face of the Western tradition of sanctity. Shaped by a powerful group of bishops, who were ever jealous of any living, charismatic rivals, the episcopal philosophy has been eloquently summarized by Peter Brown as "Call no man holy until he be dead."[108] Moreover, even the merest whisper of such claims on behalf of a living person was a still more flagrant challenge to Lateran IV, which had formally declared that no relics should be publicly venerated without papal sanction.[109]

But the threat of heresy was very real, making these desperate times. And James and Thomas—as hagiographical innovators, or perhaps even desperados—were fully equal to the situation. They clearly believed themselves to be observing the spirit of Lateran IV, if not the letter. From a certain perspective, their lofty claims on behalf of these women were at one with the papal desire to supervise the burgeoning cult of saints, which was at least partially motivated by the very real danger that the heretical "holy" might be mistaken for and worshiped as orthodox. James of Vitry and Thomas of Cantimprésimilarly had their eyes trained on heretical threats, particularly Catharism. The members of the Perfect class of Catharism, individuals who had received the *consolamentum* at a robust stage in their life cycle rather than on their deathbed, were on the verge of finishing their last baleful incarnation. They were, as their name suggests, perfected, completed, thereby already advanced beyond this

world, achieving a distinct foothold in the next. The Cathar *credentes* could gaze in awe upon the completion of the Perfect—their spiritual perfection and what this symbolized. The *credentes* "worshiped" the Perfect whenever they encountered them, making a ritual bow of self-abasement known as the *melioramentum*. James and Thomas aspired to provide orthodoxy with something as contemporaneous, mundane, and yet as potentially otherworldly as the Cathar Perfect.

At the same time, however, one must be aware of the extent to which James and Thomas were effecting something of a trompe l'oeil. The women may have been worthy of veneration during their lifetimes. However, their lives were written and circulated only after their demises, a felicitous sequence that provided something of a safety valve. From this perspective, James of Vitry's response to Fulk's request for examples of orthodox saints to refute heresy is instructive: " 'I did not agree to entrust to writing the virtues and deeds of those who are still alive, because they could in no way endure it.' "[110] Behind his strategic deference to the modesty of these women lurks James's solid sense of what is due to orthodoxy.

WOMEN AND PURGATORIAL JUSTICE

Over the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries purgatory would become the linchpin for the entire penitential system. To deny its existence went much further than to challenge the connection between an individual's earthly penance and otherworldly suffering. It was tantamount to rejecting the entire system of divine justice which posited that the actions of the living could benefit the dead. What was at issue was not just requiem masses and alms, offerings that were extremely lucrative to the church. Also in the balance was the status of vicarious suffering. The contention that an individual was permitted to suffer on behalf of another had to be protected, since the opposite contention could ultimately undermine the efficacy of Christ's passion on behalf of humanity.[111]

Holy women's status as living dead made them especially qualified to rebut heretical skepticism concerning the existence of purgatory by operating as emissaries and vicarious sufferers for its inhabitants.[112] Moreover, the ease with which female mystics communicated with the next world during their own lifetimes augured well for what they might accomplish for humanity when, on the other side of the grave, they were permanently admitted to the divine presence. James of Vitry had already depicted Mary of Oignies as possessed of an intense compassion for the souls suffering in purgatory, coupled with a prescience that permitted her to penetrate the destination of deceased souls and frequently intercede on their behalf.[113] Thomas of

Cantimpréwould further develop this quintessential female gift in his own hagiographies. Hence his supplement to the life of Mary presents the saint as providing an extensive disquisition on the nature of purgatorial fire.[114] Lutgard is privy to the purgatorial destiny of any number of souls, including ecclesiastical luminaries like Innocent III and James of Vitry.[115] Moreover, Lutgard undertook a seven-year fast on behalf of sinners, both living and dead, at Christ's behest. According to Thomas's supplement to her life, Mary of Oignies would attest on her deathbed to the effectiveness of Lutgard's great intercessory effort, describing Lutgard as a great liberator of souls from purgatory.[116] This aptitude is shared by a number of women depicted in his later work *Concerning Bees*.[117]

The extent to which women's peculiar interstitial position between living and dead recommends them for their mission on behalf of the dead is especially apparent in Thomas of Cantimpré's life of Christina Mirabilis. The vita begins, oddly, with Christina's funeral and continues, more oddly still, with her startling reanimation during the requiem mass. Christina subsequently explains to her sisters that upon her death, angels had led her to view the pains of purgatory and hell, thereafter conducting her to her ultimate and deserved destination of paradise. So moved was Christina by the sight of such suffering in purgatory, however, that she asked to return to earth in order to intercede for the souls in purgatory through the excruciating penance she undertook on their behalf. God agreed—hence her return to life.[118] After her uncanny rejuvenation, Christina was possessed of a spectral quality that literally struck horror in those who beheld her, "and people could scarcely tell whether a spirit or a material body had passed by, since she barely seemed to touch the ground." Appropriately, one of Christina's many penitential practices entailed entering the graves of the dead.[119]

Once returned to life, Christina is cast as an extremely visible proponent of the penitential system, not only urging sinners to confess and do penance but using her gifts of prophecy to discern unconfessed sins.[120] But Christina's advocacy is particularly engaged by her role as vicarious penitent, while Thomas focuses his account on the various punishments she endured in this capacity. She crept into ovens; she threw herself into roaring fires; she jumped into cauldrons of boiling water; she submerged herself in the waters of the Meuse during winter.[121] Many of the torments that Christina sought out were associated with instruments of penal servitude and torture. She stretched her limbs on the rack and suspended herself from the gallows. Her friends, although thinking her mad and attempting to restrain her, succeeded only in prolonging her own efforts: a local doctor chained Christina to a pillar in a dungeon; her sister and

friends bound her to a heavy wooden yoke.[122] Meanwhile, God kept his part of the bargain and released many souls from purgatory as a result of Christina's exertions.

The very emphasis on purgatory focuses attention on and reifies mechanisms of judgment, which many heretics openly contested. For instance, a representative inquisitional manual from the mid–thirteenth century suggests that heretics of many different persuasions were united in their tendency to test orthodox views of the judgment ensuing after death, while some denied the existence of judgment altogether, arguing salvation for all.[123] This position is further commemorated by heretical testimony in inquisitional records.[124] The merciful side of the Beguine mission in purgatory had the effect of softening the harsh contours of a rigid system of justice that consigned individuals to either heaven or hell. But it would be misleading to construe female interventions as necessarily entailing a critique of this system, except in rare instances. Caroline Walker Bynum and Barbara Newman have both identified certain female mystics who theologically challenged the necessity of hell.[125] Moreover, in 1231 a woman named Lucardis, "who was reputed to have been of a most saintly life, but who bewailed with dreadful laments the unjust banishment of Lucifer, whom she wished again restored to heaven," was burned at the stake in Trier in the course of the antiheretical purge conducted by Conrad of Marburg (d. 1233).[126] But such objections are anomalous. Nor would the women who disavowed judgment have received sponsorship from the theologically canny James of Vitry or Thomas of Cantimpré. More to their tastes was the sanguine acceptance of divine judgment represented by Mary of Oignies who, in answer to her earnest prayers about her deceased mother's fate, learned that the latter had been damned in hell for having lived off her husband's usurious earnings without penance. According to Thomas's *Supplement*:

> When the handmaid of Christ had pondered all these things in an orderly way, she blessed God's just judgement, even in regard to her mother's damnation. Nor did she weep any more about her through whom she had received the beginnings of the flesh, who had now been handed over to everlasting death. The intellectual reason of her soul, which only the Almighty created, was in harmony with God.[127]

So impressive was Mary's resignation that Thomas would return to it again in *Concerning Bees* to counteract the "stupid wonder" (*stultam admirationem*) of individuals who are surprised that the saints do not grieve over the damned.[128]

In line with what Paul Strohm has shown in his examination of the

intercessory function of queens in secular government, interventions of most female mystics could be interpreted as essential to oiling systems of justice that otherwise might atrophy through excessive rigidity. By occasionally yielding to the female supplicatory function, moreover, male justice is permitted to manifest mercy without incurring the attached stigma of weakness.[129] But—as with the ultimate intercessory paradigm, the Virgin Mary—the role these female mystics played in the course of their interaction with purgatory is in many ways cosmetic: camouflaging the implacability of divine judgment without derailing its relentless processes.[130] Women's power did not, after all, extend into hell but was limited to purgatory. This "middle place" between heaven and hell emerged, as Jacques Le Goff has shown, in response to the necessary sinfulness of the burgeoning world of commerce and fittingly remained the quintessential gray area of negotiation. And, as is well known, visions of purgatory are instantly implicated in supporting the system of masses for the dead or the inflationary system of indulgences—the worldly underbelly of other-worldliness. Thus if the experiences of these women summoned the super-natural realm into the world in an unprecedented way, they simultaneously infused the supernatural with an unprecedented worldliness. Finally, visions of this ilk constitute the most compelling evidence possible, not simply of the various mechanisms of judgment awaiting the dead, but of the very existence of the afterlife itself. This remains true even if a particular vision attempts to circumvent the operation of its judicial devices.

Thus the activities of female mystics did more to authorize than to challenge the working of divine justice as well as the various mechanisms by which it was sustained. In particular, these women could be construed as validating different kinds of pain. The work of both Caroline Walker Bynum and Barbara Newman has indicated the centrality of women's pain and suffering in their negotiations with purgatory. Jo Ann McNamara has further noted that the economy was sufficiently disadvantageous to women in this period that, although women had historically distinguished themselves as almsgivers, they now had little else to give besides their vicarious suffering.[131] But even as these external, often grim, realities acted upon and shaped women's aptitude for suffering, this aptitude would, in turn, act upon other external, often grim, realities with an exculpatory or vindicatory effect. Purgatory gave suffering new meaning by providing a more precise scale, in terms of both costs and benefits, for extraterrestrial penitential suffering. (And, as the subsequent development of the concept of "treasury of merits" implies, the mercantile metaphors are extremely apposite in this context.)132Women's embodied spirituality celebrated the new meaning and scope available to physical suffering

and would, in turn, assist in reconciling Christendom at large to a world where suffering was not just inevitable but desirable. They did this by offering themselves as object lessons for the different registers, meanings, and uses of suffering.

In the course of these women's lives and revelations, three zones for suffering are described: earth, purgatory, and hell—here listed according to a hierarchy of desirability and an inverted hierarchy of permanence. In other words, limited temporal suffering on earth was represented and theorized as better than limited temporal suffering in purgatory, which, in turn, was to be greatly preferred to unlimited atemporal suffering in hell. Earthly suffering was also, as we have seen, motivationally enhanced compared with its otherworldly counterparts: suffering in purgatory or hell was purely personal, while earthly suffering could be undertaken on behalf of another. Finally, the suffering experienced in purgatory was a cross between expiational and punitive, while hell was purely punitive, where all hopes for amelioration must terminate. Only the sufferings experienced on earth had the potential for achieving something entirely different—something implicitly demonstrated throughout the various vitae, and designated by Thomas toward the end of *Concerning Bees* as purgative probation or testing (*probatio purgativa*). This kind of earthly torment, frequently administered by the devil (albeit with God's permission), does not so much punish as test or prove the merit of an already good individual.[133] Such a manner of suffering is not simply a vehicle for salvation but a means of sanctification.

Each register is present in James of Vitry's life of Mary of Oignies. Her scrupulous perception of herself as a sinner will lead her to greater expiational heights; her prayer and penitential efforts will, in turn, free souls from purgatory. The ascetic feats she undertakes on behalf of herself and others were, consequently, a source of torment for the devil, who retaliated by tempting her to certain excesses in asceticism, particularly with regard to fasting.[134] James additionally reports that Mary claimed never to have seen a sickness that she had not wanted for herself. In keeping with this philosophy, we are told that, when suffering from paralysis, Mary asked a certain devout person to stop praying for her, as the efficacy of his prayers alleviated her illness, hence interrupting her discipline.[135] Although all of these afflictions were, in a sense, heaven-sent, one in particular is singled out as explicitly visited by God, according with the terms of purgative probation:

> Then the good Father subdued his daughter whom he loved with the whip of discipline [*disciplinae flagello subdidit*] so that the limbs of her body were wondrously twisted. . . . Then after a little time the force of the illness abated and

> she returned to herself and gave great thanks to God who lashes every son whom He receives [*qui flagellat omnem filium quem recipit* (Heb. 12.6)] because in her was clearly fulfilled what the apostle said, "When I am weak, then I am the stronger (cf. 2 Cor. 12.10)." After the Lord had proved [*probavit*] his chosen one by this infirmity as if she had been gold in a furnace (Prov.27.21), she was so fully purified and polished that she obtained fortitude from the Lord in fasts and vigils.

The image of God proving his elect as gold in the furnace, in the context of *probatio purgativa*, will be further explored later. James goes on to say that Mary was often visited by such illnesses if a friend of hers was beset by temptation. That the immediate agent administering such divinely wrought illnesses was probably the devil is suggested by the fact that the pain could be routed by the sign of the cross, which an attending cleric would make over the afflicted part.[136]

Thus suffering is presented as not simply inescapable but, more important, essential to salvation and divinely willed. Moreover, temporal and earthly suffering, the best of all possible sufferings, is presented as a positive opportunity. Thomas of Cantimpré's writings propel this formulation to the next stage, advancing beyond the mere suggestion that opportunities for earthly suffering are salvific to the more radical purification of the institutions affording such torments. And this, too, has an antiheretical salience. Heretical contentions against the reality of divine judgment were extensions of their denial to human institutions—ecclesiastical and secular—of the right to pass judgment, particularly one resulting in the death sentence. Orthodoxy, in turn, insisted on the legitimacy of the various machines of justice. Indeed, certain inquisitors will even isolate objections to the death penalty as a touchstone for heretical beliefs.[137] We have already seen that Christina Mirabilis is represented as tortured on racks and suspended from gallows—mechanisms that, unlike the cross, are invested with a quotidian immediacy. But still more disturbing undercurrents come to the fore in *Concerning Bees*. The brief series of somatic effects in contemporary spirituality discussed above tended to efface certain essential differences: a man spontaneously dies in the Holy Land from compassion for Christ; a crucifix impresses itself on the bones of a deceased friar; a woman develops a wound in her side from meditating on Christ's passion; a Christian captive, who claims to have Christ's passion in his heart, is ripped open by a tyrant to establish that this is indeed the case. Thus in the exploration of the relation between suffering and grace, the boundaries between living and dead or self-imposed and external martyrdom (occurring as a result of human or divine agency) are tested and ultimately effaced.

A similar kind of conflation occurs in a second series of examples, which professes to demonstrate that an individual is better off doing penance on earth than waiting to do so in the hereafter. Taking his cue from the seasonal habits of bees, which seemingly die in the winter only to be revivified in the spring, Thomas draws attention to the lot of the sinner who dies with sin and is reborn with penance, and then proceeds to illustrate this point.[138] The ensuing examples are startling, both in content and in the manner in which they are juxtaposed, ranging widely over disparate punitive venues. A German count, a contemporary of Emperor Henry VII and a notorious despoiler of the poor, "was seized by a grave illness by the most merciful divine piety." Instantly contrite, he restored all of the property he had on hand in addition to undertaking a vigorous penitential program, despite his infirmities. For instance, he ground his ankles and legs against the bed frame, tearing apart their very nerves.[139] A German thief converted to a life of penance, wherein he afflicted himself with burning wax so that he was "crucified with an unheard-of suffering."[140] A man lost in an Alpine pass comes upon a prostrate knight, bound on the ground, with horrible iron clubs lying on each side of him. The man admits to being a specter from purgatory visited upon the wayfarer for the latter's amelioration. In life, he had been a debauched and murderous participant in the wars between Richard the Lion-Heart and Philip Augustus. Gripped by a sudden fever, uncontrite and unconfessed, at the moment of death the knight was nevertheless fortunate enough to feel a strong impulse of contrition. Upon his death, he was instantly handed over to two demons who would torture him with the iron clubs until the day of judgment.[141] Thus the first three tales progress from self-inflicted punishment in this life to a glimpse of demonic torture in the purgatorial afterlife. The third episode is miraculously transposed to this world, however, even as the attendant demons are using contemporary instruments of torture.[142]

If the association between salubrious extraterrestrial penance and contemporary mechanisms of torture has an eerie resonance, more chilling still is the fourth instance. This concerns a convicted criminal, about to be beheaded for his crimes, who persuades the judge and executioner to a degree of complicity in his penance. Asking for a slight postponement before his execution, he sends a young relative for a many-toothed iron instrument—the like of which women used to crimp their linen—appropriately called the *dentrix*. The prisoner encourages the relative to dismember him slowly with this instrument, leaving the head until last. When only the head remains on the mutilated trunk, the prisoner says, with a cheerful expression, that he would do it all again two or three times, if this would enhance his

torment. After praying for the surrounding people and giving alms, he is finally decapitated.[143] This account is followed by an instance in the episcopal court of Peter of Corbeil, bishop of Sens, who assigns penance to a father for the murder of his daughter. The penitent will, in turn, argue that the penance is insufficient.[144]

Thomas is writing at a time when the word *poena* (punishment or penalty) is being expanded to accommodate all forms of pain, anticipating our English noun. The various stories complement this trend, pointing to the purifying power of pain regardless of the venue or tribunal through which it is administered. The vision of the knight being tortured by two demons, moreover, is a reminder that God manifests his mercy by permitting this kind of temporary and purgative punishment as opposed to the enduring torments of hell. The third story, in particular, treating the extraordinary dismemberment of a repentant criminal, bears a strong resemblance to a tale of martyrdom. Nevertheless, any possible indebtedness to the theme of martyrdom still turns upon a central reversal that is essential to an understanding of the potential political ramifications of the episode. Like a martyr, the convicted culprit embraces his torment. But while in traditional tales of martyrdom the saintly defendant is ultimately blameless and it is the tribunal that is at fault, Thomas's protagonist is indeed a criminal, and the tribunal is blameless. Moreover, unlike the pagan tribunals responsible for the deaths of the early Christian martyrs, Thomas's forum demonstrates solicitude for the salvation of the sinner, sympathetically permitting a postponement to facilitate the prisoner's extraordinary penance. Thomas, wisely, leaves the dismemberment and torture to the criminal's imaginative genius and his loyal relative's execution. Even so, the implication remains that—unlike the martyrs of yore, who died bravely but defiantly at the hands of their persecutors, of whom they were rightly contemptuous (an attitude not unlike that of contemporary Cathars toward their executioners)—the new-style martyr is one who cheerfully submits to pain at the hands of a stern but ultimately benign tribunal. Indeed, even without an appeal to the imagery of martyrdom, there is the distinct danger that the tribunal's role as purveyor of penitential pain would sanction its activities—an effect that would be enhanced by Thomas's successive movement from the secular to the ecclesiastical court. The penal and the penitential can accurately be described as merging.

The masculine cast to this series of exempla is striking. In addition to the focus on judicial tribunals, which are by definition male, Thomas isolates sins committed by secular men that have a distinctly masculine aura: rapine, theft, debauchery, murder. This set of offenses, constituting both heinous sins and crimes, would be rightly

tried and punished by both secular and ecclesiastical tribunals, a fact that further tends to conflate the operation of ecclesiastical and secular tribunals, and ultimately divine and human justice.

Yet there is a larger scope for female participation in this system in three anecdotes from the subsequent set of four, which treat the religious life and complete the chapter. A sick layman urgently seeks the religious habit and dies immediately thereafter. His soul is subsequently seen being ushered into heaven by a pious nun.[145] Then follows an instance concerning an apostate Dominican, whose damnation was also witnessed by a pious nun.[146] A final anecdote discusses the remarkable example of the Beguines of Nivelles, who in 1226 were miraculously burned by holy fire in whichever member they had sinned. Hence gluttony or loquacity was punished in the tongue, whispering in the ear, illicit touching in the hand, wandering in the shin, and salacious thinking in the breast. This occurrence, moreover, is the only one of the eight incidents to which Thomas can testify personally.[147]

These exempla focus exclusively on the operation of divine justice with respect to an assortment of religious personnel. The female role is comparatively slight, but nevertheless telling, and in keeping with what has already been glimpsed with regard to the rapport between women's supernatural gifts and church doctrine. From the episodes concerning the two visionaries who oversee the respective damnation or salvation of the male religious in question to the unfortunate Beguines who experience purgatorial fire while on earth, women are presented as key witnesses to the operation of divine justice. Even as women's new relationship to confession infuses new meaning into the concept of confessor saint, so this quasi-judicial role as witness hearkens back to, and yet transforms, the original meaning of martyr, which was "witness."[148] Moreover, by virtue of the subtle erasure of the boundaries between divine and human justice that occurs throughout this chapter, women's supernatural powers play, by implication, a salient, albeit at times covert, role in sustaining both systems.

1 Antoninus of Florence, *Confessionale Anthonini* 3.23 (Paris: Jehan Petit, 1507?), fol. 32v.

2 *VMO*, p. 547; trans. King, p. 3.

3 On the Beguine movement and its relation to Cistercian spirituality, see Ernest McDonnell, *The Beguines and Beghards in Medieval Culture* (New York: Octagon, 1969), esp. pp. 170–84; Simone Roisin, *L'Hagiographie cistercienne dans la dioc[egrave]se de Li[egrave]ge au XIIIe si[egrave]cle* (Louvain: Biblioth[egrave]que de l'Université, 1947); eadem, "L'efflorescence cistercienne et le courant féminin de piétéau XIIIe si[egrave]cle," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 39 (1943): 342–78; and G. Meersseman, "Les fr[egrave]res pr ê cheurs et mouvement dévot en Flandre au XIIIe si[egrave]cle," *AFP* 18 (1948): esp. 80 ff. Also see the following note.

[4] On the formation of the Beguines, see Walter Simons, *Cities of Ladies: Beguine Communities in the Medieval Low Countries, 1200–1565* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), pp. 35–60. See Carol Neel's contention that the Beguines were a natural extension of Cistercian communities, reinvented as a spontaneous group by James of Vitry, in her "The Origins of the Beguines," in *Sisters and Workers in the Middle Ages*, ed. Judith Bennett et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), pp. 240–60.

[5] See chap. 1, pp. 14–15, above.

[6] See Pierre-Marie Gy's discussion of how "confessor" and "penitent" are constituted in relation to one another ("Les définitions de la confession apr[egrave]s le quatri[egrave]me concile du Latran," in *Aveu*, p. 288).

[7] See, for example, Aquinas, quodlib. 1, q. 6, art. 1 [10], *Opera omnia: Quaestiones de quolibet*, ed. Ordo Fratrum Praedicatorum (Rome: Commissio Leonina, 1996), 25,2:190–91.

[8] On the significance of this work, see AndréVauchez, "Proselytisme et action antihérétique en milieu feminin au XIIIe sie`cle: la *Vie de Marie d'Oignies* (d. 1213) par Jacques de Vitry," in *Propagande et contre-propagande religieuses*, ed. Jacques Marx (Brussels: Editions de l' Universitaire, 1987), p. 95. Also see John Frederick Hinnebusch's introduction to *Historia Occidentalis of Jacques de Vitry* (Fribourg: University Press of Fribourg, 1972), p. 9 and n. 3. On the relationship between James and Mary, see McDonnell, *Beguines and Beghards*, pp. 20–36; Elizabeth Petroff, *Body and Soul: Essays on Medieval Women and Mysticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 147–51. On James, see Philipp Funk, *Jakob von Vitry: Leben und Werke* (Leipzig and Berlin: Walter Goetz, 1909); Brenda Bolton, "*Mulieres sanctae*," in *Women in Medieval Society*, ed. Susan Stuard (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1976), pp. 144–49.

[9] Vauchez's analysis emphasizes the ascetical appeal of the life as opposed to its sacramentality ("Proselytisme," pp. 95–110).

[10] For a description of Fulk's expulsion and arrival in Li[egrave]ge, see James of Vitry, *VMO*, p. 547; trans. King, p. 3. Cf. Vauchez, "Proselytisme," pp. 97–98. For an account of the chaotic nature of the see of Toulouse at the time of Fulk's accession, see William of Puylaurens (fl. 1242–48), *Chronique. Cronica Magistri Guillelmi de Podio Laurentii* c. 7, ed. and trans. Jean Duvernoy (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1976), pp. 42–46. On the experiences of James and Fulk preaching the Albigensian Crusade, see ibid., c. 28, pp. 102–13. On Fulk's antiheretical activity, see Yves Dossat, "La répression de l'hérésie par les év ê ques," *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 6 (1971): 230–33; on his brutal summary procedure against heretics and exhumations of heretical bodies, see William Pelhisson, *Chronique (1229–1244), Suivie de r è cit des troubles d'Albi (1234)*, ed. and trans. Jean Duvernoy (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1994), pp. 42–45; Dossat, "La répression," pp. 237–38).

[11] For a summary of Cathar beliefs, myths, and rituals, see Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 2d ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), pp. 106–11, 114, 121–22; idem, *The Cathars* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), pp. 141–65.

[12] James commends the goodness of marriage earlier in the life. See *VMO*, pp. 547–48; trans. King, pp. 3–4.

[13] Vauchez, "Proselytisme," pp. 98, 102–3. Also see Herbert Grundmann, *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages*, trans. S. Rowan (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995), pp. 76, 242. On the marriage of Mary and her husband, John, see Dyan Elliott, *Spiritual Marriage: Sexual Abstinence in*

Medieval Wedlock (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1993), pp. 239, 253, 254, 258–59.

[14] Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 64, 252–53, 329 n. 139.

[15] *VMO*, p. 548; trans. King, p. 8. On women and eucharistic devotion, see Bynum, *Holy Feast*; Roisin, *L'Hagiographie cistercienne*, pp. 111–14.

[16] *VMO*, p. 547; trans. King, p. 3.

[17] *VMO*, p. 551; trans. King, p. 20.

VMO

[18] *VMO*, p. 551, trans. King, pp. 20–21; cf. *VMO*, p. 567, trans. King, p. 88.

[19] See Raymond of Peñafort, *Summa de poenitentia et matrimonio* 3.34.6 (Rome: Joannes Tallini, 1603), p. 442.

[20] *VMO*, p. 551; trans. King, p. 21.

[21] *VMO*, p. 552; trans. King, p. 22. On Mary's wounds as anticipating the stigmata of Francis of Assisi, see chap. 4, n. 181, below.

[22] *VMO*, p. 551; trans. King, p. 20.

[23] *VMO*, p. 562; trans. King, pp. 67–68.

[24] Thomas claims to have loved James from the time he was fifteen when he first heard him preaching (*SVMO*, p. 581; trans. King, p. 36).

[25] See Carolyn Muessig's summary and analysis of serm. 25 from James of Vitry's *Sermones feriales et communes* against the Cathars in "Les sermons de Jacques de Vitry sur les cathares," *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 32 (1997): 69–83.

[26] *SVMO*, p. 579; trans. King, p. 31.

SVMO

[27] *SVMO*, p. 580; trans. King, pp. 32–35.

[28] *De apibus* 2.53.32, p. 513. His sins must have been considerable, since this pivotal confession occurred on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land.

[29] Ibid. 2.30.48, p. 354. For examples of particular cases Thomas handled in this capacity, see 2.30.3, p. 321; 2.30.9, p. 324; 2.30.55, p. 359.

[30] *VLA*, p. 202; trans. King, p. 59. *VLA* was written after 1246. Also see Guido Hendrix, ed.,

"Primitive Versions of Thomas of Cantimpré's *Vita Lutgardis*," *C î teaux* 29 (1978): 153–206. The supplement to James of Vitry's life of Mary of Oignies was written between 1227 and 1231; the life of Christina Mirabilis was written ca. 1232; and the life of Margaret of Ypres was written ca. 1240.

[31] For dating, see Simone Roisin, "La méthode hagiographique de Thomas de Cantimpré," in *Miscellanea Historica in Honorem Alberti de Meyer* (Louvain: Biblioth[egrave]que de l'Université, 1946), 1:548–49.

[32] Thomas did not know Margaret personally. The details for her life were supplied to him by Friar Zeger (*VMY*, p. 107; trans. King, p. 17). On Margaret's background and vocation, see G. Meersseman, "Les fr[egrave]res pr ê cheurs," pp. 72–79.

[33] At the time of this critical confrontation, the eighteen-year-old Margaret had almost gone back on her early spiritual promise by falling in love with a handsome young man (*VMY*, pp. 108–9; trans. King, pp. 18–20).

[34] *VMY*, p. 109; trans. King, pp. 20–21. Note certain analogues with Paul and Thecla. Thomas uses the same biblical phrase when Mary of Oignies has a similar insight about a rich merchant who came to visit her (*SVMO*, p. 574; trans. King, p. 7).

[35] *VMY*, p. 111; trans. King, pp. 24–25. The vision conferred a capacity for still greater levels of fasting and self-mortification (*VMY*, pp. 114–15; trans. King, pp. 30–31).

[36] *VMY*, pp. 116–17; trans. King, pp. 35–36.

[37] On one occasion, the intensity of Margaret's longing for her confessor in order to allay her scruples provokes a miracle, whereby she is permitted to picture Friar Zeger very clearly in her mind, although he is five leagues away in Lille. Drawing on his scientific knowledge, Thomas likens Margaret's miraculous vision to that of a lynx, which can penetrate opaque objects with the light cast from its eyes (*VMY*, pp. 122–23, trans. King, pp. 46–48; cf. Thomas's *Liber de natura rerum* 4.58, ed. H. Boese [Berlin:Walter de Gruyter, 1973], 1:143). For other attacks of scrupulosity, see *VMY*, pp. 118–19, trans. King, pp. 28–29; *VMY*, p. 120, trans. King, p. 42.

[38] *VMY*, p. 119; trans. King, p. 40. Cf. Dorothea of Montau's relationship with her confessor in Dyan Elliott, "Authorizing a Life: The Collaboration of Dorothea of Montau and John Marienwerder," in *Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and Their Interpreters*, ed. Catherine Mooney (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), pp. 168–91.

[39] *VMY*, pp. 128–29; trans. King, p. 59.

40 See John Coakley, "Friars as Confidants of Holy Women in Medieval Dominican Hagiography," in *Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe*, ed. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Timea Szell (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991), pp. 222–46; idem, "Gender and the Authority of Friars: The Significance of Holy Women for Thirteenth-Century Franciscans and Dominicans," *Church History* 60 (1991): 445–60.

[41] *VLA*, p. 202; trans. King, p. 59. Cf. *VMO*, p. 565; trans. King, p. 78. James's letter of 1216 recounts how his baggage train was miraculously rescued by the intervention of his "mother," Mary of Oignies (*Lettres de Jacques de Vitry*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens [Leiden: Brill, 1960], ep. 1, p. 72); cf. *SVMO*, p. 579, trans. King, p. 27; cf. *VMY*, p. 110, trans. King, p. 22). Thomas also strove to place Lutgard in spiritual conversation with James and Mary. For example, James is represented as giving the illiterate Lutgard practical advice bearing on her spiritual life, counseling subordination to a more learned sister in her order (*VLA*, p. 207; trans. King, p. 88). See James's letter to Lutgard and the rest of her community in which she is referred to as "my most spiritual friend" (*Lettres de Jacques de Vitry*, ep. 2b, p. 79); also see ep. 6c. The otherworldly intervention described below further demonstrates the linkages between the two holy women and their clerical sponsors.

[42] *VLA*, p. 192; trans. King, p. 10. Bernard clearly contributed in some way to this vita, at the very least as a privileged informant. See, for example, *VLA*, p. 205, trans. King, p. 79; *VLA*, p. 199, trans. King, p. 44. Note that King thinks Bernard is actually the author of this earlier life (*Life of Lutgard*, p. 120 n. 49). The Bollandists identify Bernard as penitentiary to Innocent IV (see *AA SS*, *commentarius praevius*, June, 4:187). Gregory IX, however, also had a Dominican penitentiary named Bernard who could have been Lutgard's confessor (Auvray, nos. 4812 [22 March 1239], 4917 [20 August 1239], 4918, 6089 [18 July 1241]). Moreover, this same Bernard plays a small role in exposing the inquisitor Conrad of Marburg's abuses (see chap. 3, pp. 98–99, below; Lea, *Inquisition*, 2:336, 344–45). Note that "papal penitentiary" in this period means someone with the papal power of absolution. But later Thomas says explicitly that he is confessor to the pope as well (*VLA*, p. 205; trans. King, p. 81). Bernard came especially to Aywie`res for Lutgard's extreme unction since she thought, wrongly as it turned out, that she would die (*VLA*, p. 206; trans. King, pp. 84–85).

[43] *VLA*, pp. 202–3; trans. King, pp. 65–66. Cf. *De apibus* 2.10.7, pp. 160–61. See John of Freiburg's efforts to comfort the priest who, in the course of

hearing a confession, is stimulated by sins of the flesh of which he had not hitherto been aware (*Summa confessorum* bk. 3, tit. 34, q. 81; bk. 3, tit. 34, q. 83 [Rome: n.p., 1518], fols. 192r, 192v–93v; cf. Raymond of Peñafort, *Summa de poenitentia* 3.34.30, p. 465; Antoninus of Florence, *Confessionale*, fol. 28r). John Gerson will even invoke the rhetoric of martyrdom on behalf of a priest aroused against his will (see Dyan Elliott, *Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages* [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999], pp. 24, 29). Thomas's complaints about such hazards continue in his later writings (*De apibus* 2.10.7, p. 161). See Alexander Murray, "Counselling in Medieval Confession," in *Handling Sin: Confession in the Middle Ages*, ed. Peter Biller and Alastair Minnis (University of York: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell and Brewer, 1998), pp. 72–73.

44 James of Vitry was freed from his dangerous attachment to a female religious through Lutgard's prayerful intervention (*VLA*, pp. 196–97; trans. King, p. 30). She also interceded on behalf of a prior for his release from purgatory, where he was being punished for an excessively harsh rule (*VLA*, p. 197; trans. King, pp. 31–32), and often intervened to assist potential penitents in making a confession. Thomas concludes with an exemplum about a mysterious pilgrim, expert in discerning unconfessed sins, who has an eye on top of his head, representing God's knowledge of all sins (*VLA*, p. 202; trans. King, pp. 64–65). Cf. Christina Mirabilis's spirit of prophecy, which revealed secret sins (*VCM*, p. 655; trans. King, p. 18). Christina Mirabilis is also alluded to in James of Vitry's prologue to Mary's life (*VMO*, p. 548; trans. King, p. 6). This kind of service is not restricted to the Beguine milieu. The Vallombrosan abbess Humility of Faenza (d. 1310) performed the same office for her community (*Le Vite di Umilt[agrave] da Faenza: Agiografia trecentesca dal latino al volgare*, ed. Adele Simonetti [Florence: Sismel, Edizione de Galuzzo, 1997], c. 26–28, p. 11; on the secret sin, see chap. 5, pp. 223, 226–27, below).

45 *VLA*, p. 205; trans. King, p. 77.

46 *Glossa ordinaria* to Ps. 115.16, ad v. *O domine quia* (citing Augustine), vol. 3, fol. 259r.

47 For the Cathars, see the account of Ralph of Coggeshall (d. 1218) excerpted and translated in *WE*, p. 253; Rainerius Sacchoni's *Summa* (1250) in *WE*, p. 333; and the *Brevis summula* of an anonymous Franciscan friar (between 1250 and 1260) in *WE*, p. 356. For the Waldensians, see Stephen of Bourbon's account, in *WE*, p. 347; Anselm of Alessandria's notebook (1266), in *WE*, p. 371. Cf. Bernard of Fontcaude's account, based on a debate between some Waldensians and orthodox proponents (ca. 1190), in *WE*, p. 213. See Bernard Gui, *Practica inquisitionis hereticae* 5.4, ed. Célestin Douais (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1886), p. 248; trans. in *WE*, p. 391. Also see Caesarius of Heisterbach's account of the Waldensians and the Cathars in *Dialogus miraculorum* 5.20–21, ed. Joseph Strange (Cologne, Bonn, Brussels: J. M. Heberle, 1851), 1:299–303, trans. H. Von E. Scott and C. C. Swinton Bland, *The Dialogue on Miracles* (London: George Routledge, 1929), 1:342–44. With regard to Cathar and Waldensian skepticism concerning the cult of saints, seeMariano d'Alatri, "Culto dei santi ed eretici in Italia nei secoli XII e XIII," *Collectanea Franciscana* 45 (1975): 85–104; Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), pp. 216–18; Carol Lansing, *Power and Purity: Cathar Heresy in Medieval Italy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 126, 127. Not all heretical sympathizers were consistent, however. See ibid., pp. 90, 99; AndréVauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*, trans. Jean Birrell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 425–26 n. 2. On Cathar discussions of Christ's supposed miracles, see Raoul Manselli, "Il

miracolo e i catari," *Bollettino della Societ[agrave] di Studi Valdesi* 97 (1976): 15–19; Lansing, *Power and Purity*, p. 128.

[48] The "novice" in Caesarius of Heisterbach's dialogue expressed befuddlement over what the Cathars stood to gain from dying, since they rejected the resurrection of the body, purgatory, etc. (*Dialogus miraculorum* 5.21, 1:301; trans. Scott and Bland, 1:344–45).

[49] William of Puylaurens, *Chronique* c. 13, pp. 61 ff.; Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, pp. 97–98, 133–38, 139–40.

[50] Edward Peters observes a similar impulse at work among the Protestants, who venerated their own dead (*Inquisition* [Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989], pp. 126–29).

[51] Stephen of Bourbon, *Anecdotes historiques, l è gendes et apologues tir è s du recueil in è dit d'Etienne de Bourbon*, ed. A. Lecoy de la Marche (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1877), no. 348, p. 308; cf. no. 350, p. 310.

[52] William of Newburgh, in *WE*, p. 247.

[53] Ralph of Coggeshall, in *WE*, p. 253. The girl's death, occurring sometime between 1175 and 1180, was the result of a spiteful denunciation by the cleric Gervaise of Tilbury. When the girl refused his advances, equating loss of virginity with damnation, he recognized her as a heretic.

[54] See Pelhisson, *Chronique*, pp. 62–63. The passage is cited as an epigraph to chap. 4, below. See Dossat, "La répression," pp. 238–39.

[55] Pelhisson, *Chronique*, pp. 80–83.

[56] Vauchez, *Sainthood*, pp. 147–55; Cf. Miri Rubin's "Martyrdom in Late Medieval Europe," in *Martyrs and Martyrologies*, ed. Diana Wood, Studies in Church History, vol. 30 (Oxford: Black-well, 1993), p. 162. Note the cult surrounding the martyred heretics of southern France, particularly the case of Esclarmonda Durban, whose trial was believed to have been irregular (chap. 4, pp. 175–76, below). This tendency is epitomized in the cult of a "martyred" dog. See Jean-Claude Schmitt's *The Holy Greyhound: Guinefort, Healer of Children since the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Martin Thom (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

[57] On martyred inquisitors, see Pierre Delooz, "Towards a Sociological Study of Canonized Sainthood," in *Saints and Their Cults*, ed. Stephen Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 206, 215 n. 24.

[58] Vauchez, *Sainthood*, p. 37; see Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay's discussion of Peter of Castro's work in Toulouse (trans. *WE*, pp. 36–37).

work in Toulouse (trans. 59 Ibid., p. 142 n. 3.

[60] See Yves Dossat, "Le massacre d'Avignonet," *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 6 (1971): 343–59; idem, *Les Crises de l'Inquisition Toulousaine au XIIIe sie`cle (1233–73)* (Boudeaux: Imprimerie B[egrave]ire, 1959), pp. 146–51. See William of Puylaurens, who makes the most of this episode, in *Chronique* ann. 1242, c. 43, pp. 166–67.

[61] On his career, see Antoine Dondaine, "Saint Pierre Martyr," *AFP* 23 (1953): 66–162; Lea, *Inquisition*, 2:207 ff. Dondaine's article was, in fact, written as a reaction to Lea's dismissive treatment of Peter's cult.

[62] Dondaine, "Saint Pierre Martyr," pp. 87–88. Peter may also have been responsible for an inquisitorial manual. See Thomas Käppelli's excerpts, "Une Somme contre les hérétiques de S. Pierre Martyr (?)," *AFP* 17 (1947): 294–335.

[63] Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:460.

[64] See Vauchez, *Sainthood*, pp. 415 ff. Cf. Rubin, "Martyrdom," pp. 157 ff.

[65] William of Auvergne, *De virtutibus* c. 21, in *Opera omnia* (Paris: A. Pralard, 1674; reprint, Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1963), 1:186. This position might theoretically exculpate the heretic from wrongdoing since he or she could not

exercise free will (*De fide* c. 2, in *Opera*, 1:9).

[66] Stephen of Bourbon, *Anecdotes* no. 18, pp. 25–26; no. 336, p. 286; no. 333, p. 283.

[67] Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum* 5.18, 1:296–98; trans. Scott and Bland, 1:338–41. Cf. 9.12, 2:175–76; trans. Scott and Bland, 2:118. See Caroline Walker Bynum's effort to come to terms with the tenor of violence, in "Violent Imagery in Late Medieval Piety," *German Historical Institute* 30 (2002): 3–36.

[68] *VMO*, p. 565; trans. King, pp. 80–81. James also notes that, just before Mary died, he was preparing to preach the Crusade against heretics and sign the crusaders with the customary crosses (*VMO*, p. 569; trans. King, p. 93). Cf. the rhetoric of martyrdom in connection with the Albigensian Crusade in *SVMO*, p. 574 (bis); trans. King, pp. 7, 9. Thus when describing the general slaughter under Simon de Montforte, at least one manuscript of the thirteenth-century monkish chronicler Albric adds James of Vitry's account of Mary's vision of the crusaders' glorified souls, alongside their angelic escort (*Albrici monachi Triumfontium Chronicon* ann. 1211, ed. P. Scheffer-Boichorst, *MGH SS*, 23:892). Also see ann. 1213, p. 897, regarding Mary's death.

[69] See n. 13, above.

[70] On the early worship of martyrs and confessors, see Hippolyte Delehaye, *Sanctus: Essai sur le culte de saints dans l'antiquit è* , Subsidia Hagiographica, 17 (Brussels: Bollandists, 1927), pp. 74–75, 109–21; P. Ranft, "The Concept of Witness in the Christian Tradition," *Revue B è n è dictine* 102 (1992): 11–12. I am indebted to Ian Forrest for this latter reference.

[71] See Jennifer O'Reilly, " 'Candidus et Rubicundus': An Image of Martyrdom in the 'Lives' of Thomas Becket," *AB* 99 (1981): esp. 305–6. My thanks to Henry Mayr-Harting for this reference.

[72] Gregory the Great, *Dialogues* 3.26, ed. Adalbert de Vogué, *SC*, no. 260 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1980), 2:370–71; trans. O. J. Zimmerman, *FC*, 39 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1959), pp. 160–61; cf. Gregory of Tours's comment "By resisting vices you will be considered a martyr" (as cited in Raymond Van Dam's introduction to his translation of Gregory of Tours, *Glory of the Confessors* [Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1988], p. 11). Ranft points out that the concept of confessor saint emerges soon after the original meaning of martyr begins to mutate ("The Concept of Witness," pp. 12–13).

[73] Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum* 8.69, 2:139–40, trans. Scott and Bland, 2:70–71; Vauchez, *Sainthood*, pp. 152–53 n. 34. See Beryl Smalley, *The Becket Conflict and the Schools: A Study of Intellectuals in Politics* (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1973).

[74] Cf. Caroline Walker Bynum's statement: "The holy bodies so central in late medieval piety are, exactly in their peculiar conjunction of exuding and closure, liminal (that is transitional) between life and death" ("Bodily Miracles and the Resurrection of the Body in the High Middle Ages," in *Belief in History: Innovative Approaches to European and American Religion*, ed. Thomas Kselman [Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991], p. 71).

[75] *VMO*, p. 552; trans. King, p. 22.

[76] *VMO*, p. 548, trans. King, pp. 4–5; cf. p. 549, trans. King, p. 10. Later, he anticipates the mockery of clerics who only sit around reading Gratian (*VMO*, p. 564; trans. King, p. 76). Cf. Thomas's similar denunciations of hostile Christians in *VLA*, p. 197, trans. King, p. 35; *VLA*, p. 205, trans. King, p. 79. James does not, however, eschew associations with the traditional confessor saints: a reference to Jerome's *Vitae patrum* and Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*

appears in the first chapter (*VMO*, p. 547; trans. King, pp. 1–2).

77 *VMO*, p. 548; trans. King, pp. 5–6.

78 *VMY*, p. 129; trans. King, p. 61. Margot King notes that there are other subtle allusions to Agnes in Margaret's life. See her translation of *VMY*, p. 67 n. 22; p. 81 n. 91.

79 *VLA*, p. 192 (bis); trans. King, pp. 6, 7. See King's comments on pp. 116–17 n. 38 and p. 117 n. 39. See Roisin, *L'Hagiographie cistercienne*, p. 190. Cf. the very similar vision received by one of Thomas's penitents, a woman from Brabant who was severely tempted by demons for love of a certain man. Christ sang her a little love song in the vernacular and her temptation disappeared (*De apibus* 2.27.25, pp. 555–57).

80 *VLA*, p. 200; trans. King, pp. 50–51. Thomas is also careful to note that there were two witnesses to this marvel, in addition to the scar that remained on Lutgard's body. This miracle coincided with yet another: Lutgard ceased to menstruate, though she was only twenty-eight, thus escaping "the nuisance with which God tamed pride in the sex of Eve." An unnamed priest temporarily partook of Lutgard's mental image of herself as bespattered with blood (*VLA*, pp. 200–201; trans. King, pp. 52–53).

81 See Yves Dossat, "Le 'bu ê cher de Montségur' et les bu ê chers de l'inquisition," *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 6 (1971): 370–73. Dossat sees this kind of summary process as antithetical to the more fully developed procedure of later papal inquisitors.

82 William of Puylaurens, *Chronique* c. 44, pp. 172–75. Dossat argues that the actual burnings occurred not at Montségur but at Bram (see "Le 'bu ê cher de Montségur,' " pp. 365–69; and Lambert, *The Cathars*, pp. 167–69). Cf. the slaughter of eighty *credentes* that occurred at Agen in 1249 (William of Puylaurens, *Chronique* c. 46, pp. 184–85).

83 *De apibus* 1.25.1, pp. 99–100.

84 Ibid. 1.25.2, p. 100. The following section likens humankind to the harpy that killed Christ and then, upon seeing its own human face in the water, never ceased to mourn him (1.25.3, pp. 100–101).

85 Ibid. 1.25.4, pp. 101–2.

86 Ibid. 2.25.5, p. 103.

87 Ibid. 1.25.6, pp. 103–4.

88 Ibid. 1.25.7, p. 105.

89 Ibid. 1.25.8, pp. 105–6. See Ignatius's *passio* in James of Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, ed. Giovanni Maggioni (Florence: Sismel, 1998), 1:236–37; trans. William Granger Ryan, *The Golden Legend* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993), 1:143; cf. Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale* 10.51, in *Speculum quadruplex; sive Speculum maius* (Douai: B. Belleri, 1624), 4:387–88.

90 Gui, *Practica* 5.2.8, pp. 255–56; trans. *WE*, pp. 402–4. Cf. Caesarius of Heisterbach's observation (put in the mouth of the "novice" of his dialogue) that individuals sometimes pretend to be possessed for profit (*propter quaestum*) —presumably receiving alms or other charities (*Dialogus miraculorum* 5.12, 2:291–92; trans. Scott and Bland, 1:332–33).

91 *De apibus* 2.57.68, pp. 592–93. ž

92 See SlavojZžižžek's reading of the appointment in Samarra in *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (London: Verso Books, 1989), p. 58. Zžižžek bases his analysis on Somerset Maugham's rendition of the tale in his play *Sheppey*. The heretic's complicity with his doom is even more clearly articulated in Jean Gobi's later collection of exempla in which the avenging demoniac cries out, "You believed you could evade the hands of the inquisitors by fraud, but I will perform the

office of the inquisitor," in *La Scala coeli*, ed. Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1991), no. 560, p. 408. This anecdote is mistakenly attributed to James of Vitry. Also see Frederic Tubach, *Index Exemplorum: A Handbook of Medieval Religious Tales*, Folklore Fellows Communications, no. 204 (Helsinki: Suodmalainen Tiedeakatemia, Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1969), no. 2122.

93 Saint Aichard was a seventh-century abbot of Jumi[egrave]ges who, fleeing from Viking persecution, went to Asper (John Molanus, *Natales sanctorum Belgii* [Louvain: Ioannes Masius and Philippus Zangrius, 1595], 15 September, fols. 203r–v). "Boogris" and its correlatives (the antecedent of today's "bugger") is thought to derive from Bulgar, since Bulgaria was associated with the spread of Catharism. If this was the individual's nickname, it would seem that he was already notorious for his heretical beliefs, which would explain his ruse. (William of Auvergne's view that the heretic was by definition a demoniac of sorts, alluded to above, was a minority view.) Thomas of Cantimpré's editor, Colvener, also notes in a marginal gloss that other editions substitute Eligius for the name Aegidius (*De apibus*, p. 593). This alternative name is also used by the sixteenth-century preacher Bernard Lutzenburg when he alludes to this episode, referring the reader to Thomas (see Paul Fredericq's *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis Neerlandicae* [Ghent: J. Vuylsteke; The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1889], no. 107, 1:106; cf. no. 29, 2:49). The substitution of Aegidius for Eligius makes a certain amount of sense. Saint Eligius (or Eloi), the patron saint of goldsmiths, is particularly associated with curing demoniacs (see Colvener's endnotes in *De apibus*, p. 165 n. 68). But if the original name was, in fact, Eligius, this was as good as calling him "demoniac heretic." Thus the seeming historicity of the anecdote is also an encoded joke, and a rather obvious one at that. I am indebted to the Graduate Medieval Church History Group at Oxford University (to which I presented part of this chapter in spring 2000) for their reflections on the unfortunate heretic's name.

94 See Charles Homer Haskins's essay "Robert le Bougre and the Beginnings of the Inquisition in Northern France," in his *Studies in Mediaeval Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929), pp. 219–20, esp. p. 220 n. 5. On Robert's alleged heretical background, see pp. 210–11 and Matthew Paris's account, excerpted in Fredericq's *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis*, no. 116, 1:111–13. The *Breve chronicon Lobiense* specifically mentions Robert's execution of heretics at Cambrai and Douai in 1235 (ibid., no. 94, 1:95). Also see chap. 5, p. 229, below.

95 Aquinas, quodlib. 6, q. 4, art. 1 [6], in *Opera omnia*, 25,2:300–302. For opposing views, see chap. 6, pp. 241–44, below.

96 William of Auvergne, *De virtutibus* c. 21, in *Opera*, 1:186. Also see n. 65, above.

97 Bynum, *Holy Feast*, pp. 122–28; eadem, "Bodily Miracles," p. 71.

98 *De apibus* 1.25.7, p. 105; *SVMO*, pp. 574–75, trans. King, pp. 10–12; *VLA*, p. 195, trans. King, p. 19.

99 *VMO*, p. 548, trans. King, pp. 7–8; p. 551, trans. King, p. 18; p. 552 (passim), trans. King, pp. 22, 24, 25; p. 562, trans. King, pp. 64–66; p. 565, trans. King, pp. 79–80; p. 567, trans. King, p. 87; pp. 568–69, trans. King, pp. 92–93. Christina's raptures are also alluded to in *VMO*, p. 548; trans. King, p. 9. Thomas of Cantimpréstrategically represents how men who had contact with Mary or her relics were likewise the beneficiaries of mystical revelations (*SVMO*, p. 574, trans. King, p. 9; p. 578, trans. King, pp. 26–27). Also note the raptures in *VCM*, p. 653, trans. King, p. 10; p. 656, trans. King, p. 21; p. 657,

trans. King, p. 23; p. 659, trans. King, p. 29; *VMY*, p. 110, trans. King, p. 22; p. 117 (bis), trans. King, pp. 35, 36; p. 118, trans. King, p. 39; p. 120, trans. King, p. 42; p. 121, trans. King, p. 43; p. 122, trans. King, p. 46; pp. 123–24, trans. King, pp. 46–47; p. 123, trans. King, p. 49; p. 126, trans. King, p. 53; *VLA*, pp. 192–93, trans. King, p. 12; p. 193, trans. King, p. 16; pp. 200–201, trans. King, pp. 52–53; p. 204, trans. King, p. 72; p. 205, trans. King, p. 78; p. 206, trans. King, p. 84; p. 209, trans. King, p. 93.

100 See Vauchez, *Sainthood*, pp. 427 ff.

101 Lutgard's skin, for example, is described as lifelike after her death, while her eyes cannot be shut (*VLA*, p. 193; trans. King, pp. 94–95).

102 See Bynum, "Bodily Miracles," pp. 82–83.

103 James implies that the finger preserved one of his pack mules, conveying many of his books, from drowning (*Lettres de Jacques de Vitry*, ep. 1, p. 72). Thomas claims that the relic was instrumental in saving James himself from a shipwreck (*SVMO*, pp. 578–79; trans. King, p. 27).

104 Thomas of Cantimpré, *SVMO*, pp. 577–78, trans. King, pp. 22–24; *VLA*, p. 209, trans. King, pp. 98–99. Cf. Raymond's terse pronouncement, alluded to in chap. 1, that he who doubts in faith is an infidel. William of Rennes's gloss on this passage, however, argues that if afflicted involuntarily by the spirit of blasphemy, an individual is not considered sinful (*Summa de poenitentia* gloss u. ad v. *Dubius in fide* 1.5.10, p. 44). According to James of Vitry, Mary had a singular grace against the spirit of blasphemy. See her intervention on behalf of a Cistercian nun (*VMO*, pp. 553–54, trans. King, pp. 29–32; also see p. 561, trans. King, p. 61).

105 *VLA*, p. 209; trans. King, pp. 98–99. There is no mention that Elisabeth's finger was cut off, though her body was ravaged by the pious (see chap. 3, p. 100, below). The right hand seems to be the preferred relic for Thomas. When the body of Saint Theodulph was discovered in Trier, Thomas requested the saint's right hand for his community (*De apibus* 2.53.2, pp. 487–88).

106 *SVMO*, p. 577; trans. King, pp. 19–21. This kind of division and disposition of bodies spread from north to south over the course of the thirteenth century. See Elizabeth Brown, "Death and the Human Body in the Later Middle Ages: The Legislation of Boniface VIII on the Division of the Corpse," *Viator* 12 (1981): 221–70, esp. 228–35; Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, pp. 200–213.

107 Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Bk. VII: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis, 1959–1960*, trans. Dennis Porter (New York: Norton, 1992), pp. 270–83.

108 Peter Brown, "Eastern and Western Christendom in Late Antiquity: A Parting of the Ways," in *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982), p. 185.

109 See Lateran IV, c. 62, Tanner, 1:263–64. Also see chap. 4, pp. 120, 128, below.

110 *VMO*, p. 549; trans. King, p. 10.

111 See Bynum, *Holy Feast*, pp. 120–21.

112 Regarding the heretical rejection of purgatory, see ibid., p. 252. On women's suffering as a catalyst for freeing souls from purgatory, see ibid., pp. 127, 129, 133, 171, 234. Cf. Barbara Newman, who describes these women as "Apostles of the Dead," in *From Virile Woman to WomanChrist: Studies in Medieval Religion and Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1995), pp. 109 ff. For a general discussion of the role of visions of the dead in women's lives, see Roisin, *L'Hagiographie cistercienne*, pp. 196 ff. Cf. Jean-Claude Schmitt's view that the church encouraged the circulation of ghost

stories since they substantiated claims regarding the afterlife (*Ghosts in the Middle Ages: The Living and the Dead in Medieval Society*, trans. Teresa Fagan [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998], pp. 4–5).

113 See *VMO*, p. 553, trans. King pp. 26–27; p. 579, trans. King, p. 52; cf. p. 559, trans. King, pp. 53–54. See Jo Ann McNamara, "The Need to Give: Suffering and Female Sanctity in the Middle Ages," in Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Szell, *Images of Sainthood*, pp. 199–221, esp. 213 ff. On women's important intercessory role in purgatory, see Newman, *From Virile Woman*, pp. 109–36.

114 *SVMO*, p. 574; trans. King, p. 8.

115 *VLA*, p. 197, trans. King, pp. 34–35; p. 205, trans. King, pp. 78–79. Cf. *VLA*, pp. 205–6, trans. King, pp. 82–83; and her efforts for Prior Simon of Foigny, p. 57 n. 44, above. She also intervened for humbler personages, including her own sister (p. 198; trans. King, pp. 40–42). See McNamara, "The Need to Give," pp. 214–15.

116 *VLA*, p. 198; trans. King, pp. 37–38.

117 *De apibus* 2.51.8–9, pp. 474–76.

118 *VCM*, pp. 651–52; trans. King, pp. 4–6. In fact, Christina died three times, the second time obediently returning at the behest of a nun (*VCM*, p. 659; trans. King, pp. 30–31). Cf. an anecdote in *Concerning Bees* of a Dominican who chooses years of painful sickness over three days in purgatory, having had a brief sampling of the latter (*De apibus* 2.51.11, p. 477). As Thomas of Cantimprénotes at the outset of Christina's vita, James of Vitry had already alluded to her death, reanimation, and mission to the dead in his life of Mary of Oignies (*VCM*, p. 651, trans. King, pp. 1–2; *VMO*, p. 549, trans. King, p. 9). See Barbara Newman's analysis of Christina as a "demoniac saint," in "Possessed by the Spirit: Devout Women, Demoniacs, and the Apostolic Life in the Thirteenth Century" *Speculum* 73 (1998): 763–68.

119 *VCM*, p. 658, trans. King, p. 27; p. 652, trans. King, p. 9. She was also the recipient of the kind of relic-like somatic miracles alluded to above. Her breasts, for example, miraculously exuded oil (p. 654; trans. King, p. 12).

120 *VCM*, p. 655 (bis), trans. King, p. 17, 18; p. 659, trans. King, p. 32. Also note her special friendship with Count Louis of Looz, who made confessions (nonsacramental) to Christina to enlist her prayers on his behalf. Christina would, in turn, share in his punishments in purgatory (pp. 657–58; trans. King, pp. 24–26). See Robert Sweetman's discussion of Christina as a kind of living sermon, in "Christine of Saint-Trond's Preaching Apostolate: Hagiographical Method Revisited," *Vox Benedictina* 9 (1992): 67–97, esp. pp. 72–77.

121 *VCM*, p. 652; trans. King, pp. 8–9.

122 *VCM*, p. 652, trans. King, p. 9; p. 653, trans. King, p. 11; pp. 653–54, trans. King, p. 12.

123 Kaïppelli, "Une somme contre les he è re è tiques" c. 12, p. 328.

124 See Elliott, *Fallen Bodies*, pp. 147–50.

125 See Bynum, *Holy Feast*, pp. 242–43; Newman, *From Virile Woman*, pp. 126–31. Note that the most extreme of these contenders, Hadewijch (fl. early thirteenth century) and Marguerite Porete (d. 1310), were both considered unorthodox by some of their contemporaries. Hadewijch hints that she was persecuted during her lifetime, while Marguerite was put to death for her writings.

126 See *Gestorum Treverorum continuatio quarta*, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS*, 24:401, trans. *WE*, p. 268; cf. Mansi, ann. 1231, 23:241–42. Lucardis and her companions may have been members of the so-called Luciferian sect, whose allegedly orgiastic rituals are described by Gregory IX. He concludes, "They assert in their raving that the Lord of the heavens violently, and lamentably

against justice, thrust Lucifer down into the depths of hell," Auvray, 13 June 1233, no. 1391. See Balthasar Kaltner, *Konrad von Marburg und die Inquisition in Deutschland* (Prague: F. Tempsky, 1882), pp. 144, 161–63; Lea, *Inquisition*, 2:334, 335.

127 *SVMO*, p. 576; trans. King, p. 17. Cf. the incident in *VMO*, p. 553; trans. King, p. 26. A widow whose husband had also been involved in shady business practices, however, fared much better with Mary's intervention (*VMO*, p. 559; trans. King, p. 53).

128 *De apibus* 2.54.17–18, pp. 528–30.

129 See Strohm's "Queens as Intercessors," in *Hochon's Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth- Century Texts* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992), pp. 95–115. Also see Lois Huneycutt, "Intercession and the High Medieval Queen: The Esther Topos," and John Carmi Parsons, "The Queen's Intercession in Thirteenth-Century England," in *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, ed. Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth MacLean (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995), pp. 126–46, 147–77.

130 What might be perceived as female resistance generally accentuates the basic mechanisms at work. Thus Mary of Oignies fends off demons at a woman's deathbed, praying: " 'Lord I stand surety for this soul for although she has sinned, she has confessed. If perhaps anything remains in her through neglect or ignorance . . . You have left her some time for contrition' " (*VMO*, p. 559; trans. King, pp. 50–51). This particular instance merely reminds God (actually the reader) of the beneficent effects of the sacrament of penance.

131 See n. 132, below, and nn. 112 and 113, above.

132 Jacques Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), esp. pp. 209–34; cf. idem, *Your Money or Your Life: Economy and Religion in the Middle Ages*, trans. Patricia Ranum (New York: Zone Books, 1988).

133 *De apibus* 2.57.62, p. 587.

134 For her penitential exercises, see *VMO*, pp. 551–52; trans. King, pp. 21–22. For their effect on demons, see p. 553, trans. King, p. 28; pp. 553–54, trans. King, pp. 31–32; p. 561, trans. King, p. 61. The devil calls Mary a glutton for her modest (and physically painful) repast, hoping to goad her to dangerous ascetical excesses (p. 552; trans. King, p. 23). The chunk she carved from her side was also expiation for former enjoyment of food.

135 *VMO*, pp. 563–64; trans. King, pp. 71–72. Note that sickness is also represented as a divine grace in the prologue to the life (p. 547; trans. King, pp. 6–7).

136 *VMO*, p. 556, trans. King, pp. 41–42; cf. an incident when Mary routs the devil with the sign of the cross (p. 554; trans. King, p. 32). On the efficacy of this sign against demons, see *De apibus* 2.57.33–34, pp. 562–63.

137 See chap. 4, pp. 170–71, below.

138 *De apibus* 2.51.1, pp. 467–68.

139 So confident was he about the extent of his sufferings that he predicted (rightly, it would seem from Thomas's rapportage) that he would bypass purgatory altogether (ibid. 2.51.3, p. 468).

140 Ibid. 2.51.3, pp. 468–69.

141 Ibid. 2.51.4, pp. 469–70.

142 Thomas's editor, Colvener, makes this observation in his marginal comments in ibid., p. 470.

143 Ibid. 2.51.5, pp. 471–72.

144 Ibid. 2.51.7, pp. 473–74.

145 Ibid. 2.51.8, pp. 474–75.

[146] Ibid. 2.51.9, pp. 475–76. This is followed by a section exhorting individuals not to despair since penance will revivify them (2.51.10, pp. 476–77). The third incident concerns the Dominican discussed in n. 118, above.

[147] Ibid. 2.51.12, pp. 478–79.

[148] Ranft, "The Concept of Witness," pp. 9–23.

Chapter Three

Elisabeth of Hungary: Between Men

> This book contained legends of the saints. Good God!
>
> (I speak the words reverently) what legends they were. . . .
>
> The dread boasts of confessors, who had wickedly
>
> abused their office, trampling to deep degradation
>
> highborn ladies, making of countesses and princesses
>
> the most tormented slaves under the sun. Stories like that
>
> of Conrad and Elizabeth of Hungary, recurred again and again, with all its dreadful viciousness, sickening
>
> tyranny and black impiety: tales that were nightmares
>
> of oppression, privation, and agony.
>
> (Charlotte Bronteï, *Villette*)[1]

AN OUTRAGED PROTESTANT, Charlotte Bront ë could not have chosen better than to target the relationship between Elisabeth and her confessor, Conrad of Marburg, in order to sustain her objections to the penitential system's abuse of women. For Conrad's unquestioned ascendancy over his holy penitent resulted from a constellation of factors that consolidated the confessor's power far beyond what we have hitherto witnessed in the contemporaneous Beguine milieu, endowing it with an impregnability open to abuse. Elisabeth was peculiarly susceptible by virtue of the subordination implicit first in her status as matron and then in her vulnerability as widow, and the special authority that Conrad exerted over her in both of these states. Her spirituality was largely shaped by Conrad's exacting vision of his role as spiritual director, which was, in turn, informed by his inquisitorial function. Conrad employed the same basic strategies for exposing heretical depravity and orthodox sanctity. The inquisitional influence was enhanced by the fact that behind Conrad stood Gregory IX and Raymond of PeÑafort as promoters of Elisabeth's cult—chief architects of the papal inquisition against heresy. Hence, as with the Beguines, who would develop a special affinity for the cult of this regal penitent, Elisabeth's spirituality needs to be understood in the larger context of the struggle against heresy.[2] But Elisabeth's contribution to this struggle resided not so much in the proving of particular doctrinal positions as in her exemplary and unquestioning submission to ecclesiastical authority in its sternest aspect.

The daughter of King Andrew II of Hungary and his wife Gertrude,

Elisabeth was brought up from infancy in the court of her future husband—Ludwig, the future landgrave of Thuringia—whom she married when she was about fourteen. This short but extremely happy union produced three children. The couple seem to have been genuinely in love—a refreshing contrast to most hagiographies. Ludwig had resisted familial pressures to give up the prospect of marriage to Elisabeth after shifting diplomatic strategies made a connection with Hungary less desirable. He purportedly maintained that he would sooner relinquish a mountain of gold.[3] Unlike most female saints, who are represented as finding marriage and husbands equally irksome and seem to spend much of their time evading the marriage bed, Elisabeth construed her prayerful vigils as genuine austerities precisely because they kept her from the side of her beloved husband.[4] Elisabeth also experienced intense grief on hearing the news of Ludwig's death on Crusade, which is unusual for the pious matrons of the High and later Middle Ages.[5]

Despite her cheerful accession to the married state, Elisabeth was unswervingly committed to the subversion of her social position through total self-abnegation. Her religious practices might have been regarded as rather irritating from the husband's perspective as, for example, when Elisabeth's attendants mistakenly grabbed the sleeping master's foot in attempting to awaken the mistress for prayer.[6] And yet Ludwig was genuinely sympathetic to his wife's piety, holding Elisabeth's hand while she rose from bed to pray at night.[7] Ironically, Ludwig's indulgence is perhaps best revealed by the power he was prepared to accord her confessor, Con-rad—who in 1226 exacted a vow of obedience (still deferring to the husband's superior claims, however) and a conditional vow of chastity in the event of Ludwig's death. Immediately after Ludwig's premature death, Elisabeth was spurned by her in-laws and actually driven from the castle in Wartburg. From this time on, Conrad's power over Elisabeth was absolute. His rigor exacerbated Elisabeth's own tendencies toward extreme self-mortification. Her ascetic feats brought about an early death in 1231 at the age of twenty-four. She was canonized in 1235, an event that occasioned the production of some excellent contemporary sources.[8]

Elisabeth's short life was, significantly, dominated by the forces behind the disparate confessional/inquisitional tribunals that were taking shape at precisely this time. Ludwig seems to have written to the papacy when Elisabeth's first confessor died, purportedly requiring not just a mere confessor but a man of learning as well. It was probably on the recommendation of Hugolino of Ostia, the future Gregory IX—who had visited Germany between 1207 and 1209 and thus was familiar with the court of Thuringia—that Conrad of

Marburg made his way there in 1225.9 Conrad had initially distinguished himself as a preacher of the Crusade under Innocent III. As was the case with James of Vitry, his Crusade preaching naturally shaded off into preaching against heresy, even as the church itself had turned the Crusade from its original objective of converting or killing non-Christians outside of Europe to the maintenance of internal boundaries. Certainly this kind of continuum is suggested in Caesarius of Heisterbach's vita of Elisabeth.

> Conrad first received this authority for preaching against the Saracens from the lord Pope Innocent [III]. . . . Then under his successors of blessed memory, Pope Honorius [III], and from him who today holds the Roman pontificacy, namely, the lord Gregory [IX] [he received] similar but greater authority, preaching sometimes for the correction of morals and sometimes for the repression of heretics.[10]

This may even have been the same Conrad who, according to Caesarius of Heisterbach's *Dialogue on Miracles*, tried heretics through the ordeal of burning iron at Strasbourg sometime in the second decade of the thirteenth century.[11]

Many aspects of Conrad's background remain a mystery: although he was consistently addressed as "Magister," and described by contemporaries as a man of erudition and a great preacher,[12] there is no evidence that Conrad actually attended university. In fact, there were no universities in Germany in this period, while the assertion that he attended the University of Paris originated in the fourteenth century.[13] Conrad also seems to have been unaffiliated with any particular religious order. Caesarius of Heisterbach alleges that Conrad was a secular priest, although subsequent chroniclers would associate him with the different mendicant orders, particularly the Dominicans.[14] But what seems to have recommended Conrad to Elisabeth, herself a supporter of the fledgling Franciscan movement, was his absolute commitment to poverty. As Elisabeth herself attests, "Indeed I could have made [a vow of] obedience to some bishop or abbot, who have possessions, but I thought it better to make it to Master Conrad, who has not, but lives entirely from begging, so that he should have utterly no consolation in this life."[15] Elisabeth could enact no more dramatic rejection of her social position and affluence than by her voluntary submission to a poor man of low birth.[16]

Pope Gregory IX assumed protection of Elisabeth upon Ludwig's death in 1229, perhaps having been informed by Conrad of the ill-treatment she was receiving at the hands of her in-laws and her husband's vassals.[17] Gregory may well have been acquainted with Elisabeth from his earlier sojourn in Thuringia. He was certainly her correspondent—though the only surviving letter, written after her husband's death, is not very revealing, simply exhorting her to

persevere in her pious undertakings.[18] It was Gregory who entrusted the widowed Elisabeth to Conrad, naming him as her particular defender.[19] After the burial of Ludwig, Elisabeth left for Marburg, where she assumed a gray tunic signifying her renunciation of the world—including not only her property, but even her children.[20] It was at this time that she solemnized the vow of obedience and chastity that she had taken several years earlier. With Ludwig's death, the vow of obedience would become absolute, even as the vow of chastity was now perpetual.[21]

Gregory IX's veneration of Mary of Oignies, which allegedly resulted in his miraculous release from the spirit of blasphemy, had basically been private and would, perhaps, have gone unnoticed, if not for the rather indiscreet zeal of Thomas of Cantimpré, who exposed the pope's temptation to the world. At James of Vitry's request, Gregory further affirmed the Beguine way of life through a papal bull.[22] In contrast to this private devotion and only very modest validation of the Beguine lifestyle, however, Gregory IX is at particular pains to promote Elisabeth's cult. To this end, Gregory had his own penitentiary, none other than Raymond of PeÑafort, write repeatedly to Conrad, urging him to assemble the miracles that had occurred after her death and send them to Rome.[23] When Conradbungled the job, Gregory, doubtless acting through Raymond, attempted to remedy the situation by sending a specific interrogatory for examining the witnesses to her miracles—the first of its kind, which would soon become the standard.[24] After Conrad's death in 1233, Gregory gladly reopened the case at the urging of Elisabeth's brother-in-law, the former landgrave of Thuringia, who had left the world to become a member of the Teutonic order as a result of Elisabeth's posthumous intercession on his behalf.[25] Early in 1235, a papal commission inquired into Elisabeth's life and miracles, paving the way for a smooth canonization in the very same year.[26] Luminaries such as Emperor Frederick II—whose precedential legislation on heresy was subsequently a model for secular rulers throughout continental Europe—strove to attend.[27] Moreover, to safe-guard the new cult against possible detractors, an extremely legalistic summary of the proceedings was crafted, probably by Raymond of PeÑafort. 28 Gregory further granted especially liberal indulgences (a year and forty days) to the faithful who made pilgrimages to the tomb, thus taking particular pains to foster Elisabeth's cult.[29]

Efforts were made to accentuate the extent of Gregory's implication in Elisabeth's personal history. Conrad wrote a letter to Gregory describing Elisabeth's life soon after the unsuccessful attempt to compile her miracles. In it, he repeatedly made reference to the way in which Elisabeth had been entrusted to him by Gregory himself—a

claim that served to secure Gregory within the ambit of Elisabeth's cult as well as posthumously to consolidate and justify Conrad's role in her life. In an account that circulated under the popular title "The Book of the Four Handmaidens," a slightly expanded version of the original depositions made by Elisabeth's personal attendants to the papal commission in 1235, we find a telling accretion:

> But in her tribulations she had, after God, a consoler in Pope Gregory IX, who paternally and benignly comforted her with the letters he wrote, exhorting her to perseverance in chastity and patience, proposing to her the different examples of saints and firmly promising her eternal glory. Who also receiving her person and her goods under the spiritual protection of the apostolic see recommended her to the often mentioned Master Conrad, giving him as defender to her.With him mediating, she received in estimation of her dowry the aforesaid money, all of which she expended by his counsel in alms.[30]

Again, the anonymous author emphasizes that Conrad's power over Elisabeth was contingent upon papal intervention. A mid-fourteenth-century life of Gregory IX dispenses with Conrad altogether, casting the pontiff as the main impetus behind Elisabeth's vocation and spiritual attainments.[31]

What we are in essencewitnessing in the course of Gregory and Conrad's joint sponsorship is a symbolic, but nevertheless purposeful, reallocation of the husband's prerogatives over Elisabeth. With the death of Ludwig, Elisabeth's now permanent vow of obedience to Conrad would be colored by the heightened level of obedience exacted in marriage as a result of recent developments in medieval canon law. Beginning in the twelfth century, the introduction of Roman law had gradually tightened the husband's control over his wife.[32] This tendency peaked in Raymond of PeÑafort's *Summa*, wherein Raymond upholds the husband's lordship over his wife, even when it could potentially intrude on her salvation. Thus the husband is permitted to retract his wife's pious vows, even if he had formerly authorized them, since "in obeying her husband, she obeys God [*obediendo viro, obedit Deo*]." The conflation between husband and God would be accelerated by theological formulations like those of Aquinas, who would use the analogy of the wife's offense against her husband to address the equally hierarchic situation of the sinner's offense against God.[33]

Other conditions surrounding the vow of obedience would further strengthen the priest's quasi-matrimonial prerogative over his female penitent. Such vows derived from the parallel vows associated with an entrance into monastic life. But the vow of a female religious would

be further implicated in the wider mesh of the bridal imagery so intrinsic to the ritual veiling of virgins.[34] The nun's vow was, of course, enacted in the context of community and did not require an intense personal relationship with a particular spiritual director for its fulfillment. For lay-women living in the world, however, such vows tended to bind the confessor and penitent in an intimate relation that fully participated in a heterosexual hierarchy approximating marriage. These matrimonial overtones between confessor and penitent, already suggested in Friar Zeger's relationship with Margaret of Ypres, will become very explicit in the lives of later mystics, such as the Prussian saint Dorothea of Montau.[35] It was doubtless an awareness of the intimacy fostered by such relations that prompted Francis of Assisi to forbid his friars to accept such vows from women.[36]

These rather abstract forces informing Elisabeth's vow would receive additional impetus from Gregory IX, who would see fit to exercise over Elisabeth the church's traditional role as protector of widows—a protection that extended to her property rights. Whether or not Gregory's intervention did occur at Conrad's behest, it clearly worked to the latter's advantage, since Gregory promptly transferred the power over widow and property alike to Conrad.[37] This transference of power corresponded to the reception of the gray habit —which in many ways could be likened to the groom's conferral of nuptial clothes—from Conrad's hands. Elisabeth would follow Conrad to Marburg, bringing their relationship even more closely into alignment with a virolocal marriage.[38]

Even before Ludwig's death, Conrad consistently assumed a controlling hand in Elisabeth's piety that disrupted the conjugal household. Elisabeth's celebrated food asceticism wreaked havoc with her husband's board by requiring that she and her handmaidens refuse any food that might have been purchased with suspect funds. Although this discipline is justifiably construed by feminist historians as an act of subversion of her own social position, it is nevertheless significant that the practice resulted from Conrad's explicit behest. (On her own initiative, Elisabeth consulted a doctor to make sure that such austerities would not damage her health.)[39] Although later hagiographies would represent Ludwig as interfering with his wife's distribution of alms, in fact it was Conrad who would run this quintessentially husbandlike interference by restricting Elisabeth's almsgiving.[40] Similarly, later accounts would portray Elisabeth's ongoing efforts to smuggle lepers into the marital bed; the lepers were invariably transformed into the image of the Christ child when the angry husband was on the brink of chastisement.[41] But these miracles were also clearly grounded in events occurring after Ludwig's death. As Conrad reported to Gregory IX, the discovery that Elisabeth had

concealed a leprous virgin in the house resulted in a severe beating for his holy penitent and instant expulsion for her ailing charge.[42] The fact that the patient husband would eventually be recast with the attributes of the irascible confessor in this narrative suggests the degree to which the two roles had become interchangeable in representations of Elisabeth's life. Yet the confessor would eventually supplant the husband in what was usually construed as the latter's final prerogative, since it was Conrad who was ultimately buried at Elisabeth's side in her basilica.[43]

In addition to his appropriation of the husband's authority, Conrad's position would be further augmented by the evolution of sacerdotal authority incumbent upon emphasis on the sacraments. Whether consecrating the host or hearing confession, the priest was progressively perceived as standing *in loco Dei*. Conrad's near apotheosis was hardly lost on Elisabeth, as the now famous testimony of her handmaiden Irmingard makes clear:

> She also said that the blessed Elisabeth was especially afraid of Master Conrad, but in the place of God [*in loco Dei*], saying, "If I am so afraid of a mortal man, how much more is the omnipotent God to be feared, who is the lord and judge of all."[44]

As surrogate to both God and husband, Conrad held a virtually unassailable position of authority.

"A VOICE IN RAMA": THE MARTYRED INQUISITOR

"Master Conrad of Marburg deserves to be exhumed

and burned as a heretic."

(Council of Frankfurt, 2 February 1234)[45]

Elisabeth's subjection to Conrad was probably initiated and certainly ratified by papal approval. Indeed, later hagiographers, such as Dietrich of Apolda, will reiterate this authorization as often as feasible, doubtless influenced by Conrad's frequent repetitions in his letter to Gregory IX.[46]

The degree of Conrad's authority over Elisabeth was consolidated by a similar subordination of the Thuringian church—a condition again effected through Gregory IX's approval and associated with his initiatives against heresy. Already in 1227, Conrad had persuaded Ludwig to grant him control over church appointments in Thuringia, a gesture that Conrad then encouraged the landgrave to ratify by an appeal to Gregory IX, who had ascended the papal throne in the same

year. Conrad compounded this petition with a request for power to act against heresy in Germany. Gregory was, as we have seen, particularly preoccupied with the threat of heresy, and delighted to oblige on both counts: the letter that approved Conrad's control over the Thuringian church was immediately followed by another authorizing Conrad as special agent against heresy throughout Germany.[47]

Gregory's authorization of Conrad as an inquisitor against heresy has traditionally been regarded as an important first step, anticipating the development of the later papal inquisition.[48] Some historians have challenged the extent to which Conrad actually enjoyed a papal commission, stressing his ultimate responsibility to the diocesan bishop.[49] But there can be little doubt that contemporaries viewed his papal sponsorship as particularly enabling. It was certainly a fact that stuck in the minds of coeval sources, including hagiographers of Elisabeth. One contemporary chronicler says of Conrad that "supported by papal authority and constancy of spirit, he became so bold that he feared no one."[50] Gregory did his best to abet Conrad's efforts by encouraging him to enlist local bishops and secular authorities in antiheretical initiatives. Individuals who attended Conrad's preaching against heresy received indulgences, while those who actually assisted in the eradication of heresy were rewarded with the coveted Crusade indulgence, which removed all purgatorial penance for confessed sins.[51]

Conrad's reputation was probably further enhanced by his association with the recently deceased Elisabeth's sanctity. Thus the *Annals of Worms*, which identifies Conrad as Elisabeth's confessor, immediately adds that he was "reputed as if he were a prophet."[52] The refracted aura of sanctity, in conjunction with papal authorization, temporarily immunized Conrad from opposition, producing a miasma of invincibility around the man and his methods alike.With the cooperation of the mendicant orders, Conrad traveled around, garnering accusations. Multiple sources corroborate that the accused had no option but to confess and have their heads shaved or maintain their innocence and be burned.[53] Such grim proceedings have been characterized by H. C. Lea with some justice as presenting "the essence of the inquisitorial process, reduced to its simplest terms."[54]

Conrad eventually overreached himself when he accused the powerful noble Count Henry of Seyn of heresy.[55] Owing to insufficient evidence, the charges were dismissed by a synod of bishops and nobles, including the king, who met at Mainz in 1233. Conrad, who was unreconciled to this verdict, left the council in a rage, refusing offers of an escort.[56] Three days after the council, Conrad was murdered by a group of nobles who were among the accused. Although Gregory IX was allegedly shaken by the various indictments

of Conrad's procedures that reached Rome, the latter's sudden death caused him to rally to his delegate's defense.[57] In his letter to the bishops of Germany, Gregory enlists the heady rhetoric of martyrdom. He begins with a text from Jeremiah depicting a mother's lamentation for her dead children—a text that in the New Testament was applied to the slaughter of the Holy Innocents.

> A voice in Rama (Jer. 15.31; Matt. 2.18) recently rings out, with thunder that shakes the wall of Christian sanctification —just as lightning repelled the gaze of the strong and like a thunderbolt struck the hearing of the weak—because, although precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints (Ps. 115.15), nevertheless the catholic mother church is the more affected by the removal of her children the more fully she rejoices in their battles and triumphs.[58]

He concludes by insisting that the perpetrators of this crime, and their defenders, be brought to justice.[59] But despite Conrad's death at the hands of accused heretics, coupled with Gregory's professed esteem for the deceased, there was no move to canonize Conrad. This omission is partially explained by the growing trepidation of the pope to advance anyone who died persecuting heretics, a tendency that would be confirmed by the almost universal antipathy to the man and his activity throughout Germany.

The wisdom of the pope's reticence is, to some extent, illuminated by a letter he received subsequent to Conrad's death, providing a bird's-eye view of the latter's career and demise. Jointly composed by the archbishop of Mainz and the pope's former penitentiary, the Dominican Bernard (perhaps the same Bernard who was confessor to Lutgard of Aywie`res), the letter was preserved by the monastic chronicler Albric. The authors made no secret of their profound sympathy with the desperate plight of the accused, who were "either to confess spontaneously [*sponte confiteri*] and live; or to swear innocence and immediately be burned." The devil, seemingly capitalizing on Conrad's singular procedures, accordingly "suborned false witnesses from the heretics." An important player in these events was a certain woman named Alaidis, a converted heretic who claimed that her husband had been burned for heresy. Thus credentialed, Alaidis led Conrad to her village, where she pursued a private vendetta, denouncing most of her family as heretics—an accusation doubtless shaped by her previous disinheritance. Eventually, one of her confederates, a man named Amfridus who was being held in the episcopal prison, confessed that many innocent people went to the flames, compelled by his own testimony and by "Master Conrad's fulminating judgment."

The letter grimly continues: to those who refused to confess "The Master assured martyrdom [*martyrium promittebat*]." Those who chose to confess had to purchase their lives by denouncing others, an expectation that left them in a paralyzing quandry: " 'I don't know whom I should accuse: tell me the names of whom you suspect,' " they would entreat. The archbishop of Mainz claimed that he warned Conrad repeatedly to temper his fervor, but to no avail. Indeed, following his defeat at the Council of Mainz, Conrad defied the archbishop by publicly "preaching the cross" against the many individuals who had failed to appear in answer to his charges. Such defiance cost Conrad his life. A council was held in Frankfurt the following year, allegedly to discipline Conrad's murderers, who were accordingly excommunicated. But the council was also convened to discuss other matters. An *inquisitio* was initiated to inquire into the death of three boy scholars who had been killed along with the others in the course of Conrad's purge. More generally, the question is raised as to what should be done about the innocent dead. The letter concludes by seeking the pope's advice.[60]

Such a document, produced by two such impeccably orthodox authorities as the archbishop of Mainz and a former papal penitentiary, not only dispelled Conrad's potential claims for martyrdom but actually secured the title for his victims. Moreover, the instruments by which "the Master assured [them] martyrdom" were the very tools created to ensure the church's integrity—the beginning of an ominous pattern that will continue to escalate with the establishment of a more formal office of inquisition. The letter concludes with an allusion to a corrective *inquisitio*, presumably to rehabilitate some of Conrad's victims.[61]

Albric does not yet know how the pope would respond to the letter. Even so, our chronicler seems confident that the pope "greatly repented [*penitet*] that he had permitted so much power to Master Conrad, whereby such great confusion emerged. Moreover, a certain vision was recently seen in Germany, through which it was known that Conrad was damned."[62] Other sources go still further in their indictment of the pope's inquisitor. As noted in the epigraph, one of the bishops present at the Council of Frankfurt in 1234 reportedly asserted that Conrad should be exhumed and burned as a heretic. In this volatile climate, the walls between a martyred saint and a duly executed heretic seemed paper-thin.

The church's antiheretical initiative is the grim backdrop against which Elisabeth's life was played out. And there were a number of areas where the example of her life, and her ensuing cult, were recruited to lend luster to this campaign. Her precedential significance in the history of sanctity was a clear rebuttal to Cathar dualism and

corresponding antifeminism: she was not only the first female contemporary saint (as contrasted with historical and quasi-legendary figures) but also the first matron and mother to attain sainthood under the newly centralized system of papal canonization.[63]

We can also discern certain hagiographical emphases common among Beguine saints. Elisabeth, too, helped to police the sacramental system by reminding individuals not to neglect baptizing their infants and urging the sick to confess and communicate. She is even said to have thrashed one old woman who refused to confess her sins.[64] The extreme hardships of her widowed life, moreover, led some of her hagiographers to experiment with the model of white martyrdom, as will be seen below. Certainly Elisabeth's followers also showed a marked eagerness to demonstrate her instant currency as a relic, an assertion that would carry with it a similar antiheretical valence. Her body, though unburied for four days, was free from all stench of corruption, instead producing an aromatic scent that revivified the spirit. "Many people, burning with devotion, cut pieces of material from her tunic . . . others cut her hair and nails. Some, moreover, also cut off her ears. Certain people also cut off her nipples, and saved them as relics."[65] Elisabeth herself, in a "holy jest" (*sancto ioco*), is alleged to have pointed to her tattered clothes, playfully reminding her maids to preserve these rags carefully so they would not be put to the trouble of searching when the garments were subsequently required as relics.[66]

Such gestures may seem muted when set alongside parallel motifs generated within Beguine and Cistercian circles—a measure by which Elisabeth's antiheretical potential might be perceived as suffering. Yet it is surely significant that what remains of Elisabeth's process for canonization was preserved in a manuscript exclusively dedicated to papal initatives against heresy and to Crusade preaching, a document that probably belonged to a Crusade preacher and inquisitor in the Rhineland.[67] What would her example contribute in the church's pitched battle against heresy? The answer clearly lies in her unquestioning obedience to Conrad of Marburg—confessor and, equally important, inquisitor. Since this obedience is depicted as being at the very center of Elisabeth's piety, the confessional relationship achieves a new level of prominence in her life. Elisabeth's telling conflation of her fear of Conrad with a fear of God is rendered into a compelling exemplum for the laity's prescribed attitude toward the priesthood. Thus in a time of rising anticlericalism and heretical disaffection, herein lies the didactic valence of her life. And the potency of this message could only increase in light of the assassination of her confessor—an inquisitor who was described by Gregory IX as "a man of consummate virtue and a public crier for the

Christian faith," slain by sacrilegious hands.[68]

The exact terms in which Elisabeth is said to have expressed her fear bear repeating: "If I am so afraid of a mortal man, how much more is the omnipotent God to be feared, who is the lord and judge of all."[69] This foregrounding of judgment in terms of both divine and human tribunals appears frequently in the different sources on Elisabeth. Conrad's letter to Gregory relates how, when Elisabeth was dying, she refused visitors "because she wished to meditate on both the last test of strict judgment and on her omnipotent judge [*de extremo et districti iudicii examine et iudice suo omnipotente*]." An anonymous life written shortly after her canonization describes her vow of obedience to Conrad in terms of a submission to the "judgment" (*iudicium*) of promised obedience. The author further anticipates Elisabeth's intercession in heaven, her suing on behalf of humanity "in the presence of the fearful judge [*coram tremendo iudice*]."[70] Moreover, Raymond of PeÑafort's summary of her process reports that various high-ranking clerics and secular princes united in urging Elisabeth's canonization.

> The faithful judge in heaven is a witness [*testis in celo fidelis iudex*] and clearly aware of her; he presents manifest, admirable, and excellent testimony [*testimonium*]. And since human judgment ought to imitate divine, as much as it can, [Elisabeth's example] should not be permitted to be obscured under a cloud of sinister derogation or to be suffocated under a measure of heretical pressure, so that the church militant might honor one whom the church triumphant glorifies.[71]

The canonization of Elisabeth would not simply assist in confounding heretics: it would further serve as a reminder that through the exercise of judgment, ecclesiastical tribunals further God's work on earth. This message pertains equally to the condemnation of heretics and the elevation of saints.

If absolute obedience was the essential term conditioning Elisabeth's claims to sanctity, it was important that this obedience be pressed to the limit. This was Conrad's function. According to the testimony of her handmaiden Isentrud, "Conrad many times tested [*temptavit*] her constancy, breaking her will in all things and ordering contrary things to her."[72] The following instance is representative. Once Elisabeth asked for Conrad's permission to visit the cloister in which her daughter, Gertrude, was enclosed and to which Conrad also considered sending Elisabeth. The latter believed that she had obtained this permission, when, in fact, he had cagily answered, "She can enter [the cloister] if she wishes"—which did not constitute

permission in Conrad's eyes. When she returned, Elisabeth learned she had been excommunicated. Moreover, Conrad presented her with a specially prepared text stipulating certain nonnegotiable mandates on which his continued spiritual direction depended. He made her swear by judicial oath to obey them. Brother Gerhard, Conrad's faithful companion who would later choose martyrdom alongside his master, was ordered to beat both Elisabeth and her attendant, Irmingard, during which time Conrad recited the penitential psalm *Miserere mei* (Psalm 50). Irmingard's scars lasted three weeks, while Elisabeth's lingered still longer in proportion to the greater severity of her beating.[73]

The appearance of the written mandates, the judicial oath, and the sentence of excommunication are all reminders of the ease with which other related disciplinary fora can intrude on the confessional relationship. Conrad was not alone in his introduction of such admixture. On one occasion when Thomas of Cantimprémistrusted the veracity of one of his penitents, a virginal nun, he forced her to swear a judicial oath in the course of her sacramental confession.[74] On a continuum with this deliberate strategy is Conrad's importation of an inquisitorial approach to his relations with his holy charge. When undertaking his antiheretical purge of Germany, which would eventuate in his assassination, Conrad enlisted the assistance of a number of informers like the alleged former heretic Alaidis. But he was especially reliant upon a Dominican named Conrad Tors and a one-eyed and one-handed layman named John, both of whom were likewise reported to be converts from heresy. Like Alaidis, these rather unsavory characters had already made a reputation for themselves as freelance, and often arbitrary, denouncers of heretical suspects.[75] Conrad's employment of converted heretics as spies and informers would soon become standard practice for the inquisition.

Similar agents were employed for testing Elisabeth. Conrad of Marburg drove away her beloved handmaidens one by one, reasoning that, as reminders of her earlier glory, they might be the source of temptation or regret. As the handmaiden Isentrud alleges, "He took away from her every human solace in our removal, wishing her to adhere to God alone."[76] Elisabeth's faithful servants were, in turn, replaced by spies who were encouraged to make frequent denunciations.

> Conrad introduced austere women, from whom [Elisabeth] sustained many oppressions. They behaved deceptively [*captiose*] toward her, just as Master Conrad ordered, and often reported her to Master Conrad for not preserving obedience when she gave something to the poor or asked others to give something. Afterward she was prohibited by

> Master Conrad from giving anything, because she retained nothing further, having distributed it all to the poor. Whereupon she often sustained many blows and slaps from Master Conrad for accusations [of distributing alms], blows that she heretofore chose by her own wish to sustain in memory of slaps sustained by the Lord. . . . All the adversities and contempt and many blows that Master Conrad inflicted on her with good zeal lest she fail in her proposition, she sustained with great patience and joy.[77]

These "austere women" are rendered still more repulsive in Conrad's letter to Gregory IX: "a certain religious virgin who was particularly despicable [*valde despectabili*], and a certain noble widow who was deaf and especially austere."[78] One wonders whether these were the very women who would later make an appearance in Conrad's proceedings against Count Henry of Seyn: the *Annals of Worms* claims that Conrad threatened to have the count's property confiscated and, more mysteriously, to conduct some sort of investigation "with old women."[79] Certainly Brother Gerhard, Conrad's loyal attendant, followed his master in his movement between sacramental and inquisitorial tribunals. But even when the personnel varied, there is no mistaking the techniques. In both his capacities as inquisitor and confessor, Conrad relied on spies and informers to weave a fabric of accusations that could eventuate only in confession and reprisal—never refutation and exoneration.

In his letter to Gregory IX, Conrad justifies the renovation of Elisabeth's household by aligning these changes with Elisabeth's own spiritual ambitions for herself: "Seeing that she wished to profit, I cut away from her [*ei amputans*] all her superfluous household."[80] The choice of this particular verb (*amputare*) represents the therapeutic responsibility of the clergy in its sternest guise and one almost exclusively associated with the treatment of heretics.[81] As Isentrud's testimony reveals, Elisabeth's own handmaidens were seemingly complicit in this relatively beneficent reading of Conrad's disciplinary measures, although one wonders whether their interlocutors were ultimately responsible for this interpretation. But such rationales notwithstanding, the very earliest sources for Elisabeth's life, particularly the account of the four handmaidens and Conrad's letter to Gregory IX, run the risk of sounding like a grim and senseless catalog of abuse. Indeed, Conrad's role as spiritual director was in danger of inviting an even harsher indictment than did his role as inquisitor. Hence the confessional relationship would be insufficiently cushioned from the kinds of charges leveled centuries later by a Charlotte Brontеї.

Caesarius of Heisterbach's 1237 vita of Elisabeth had the effect of

subduing such objections by placing the saint's abjection within a comprehensible telos of sanctification. Writing at the behest of the Teutonic order in Marburg, Caesarius notes in his prologue that Conrad had already be-sought him to compose such a life.[82] Caesarius was known for his prowess as a chronicler of contemporary religiosity, who was apprised of the remarkable rise of female spirituality in this period. Several of the chapters of his popular *Dialogue on Miracles*, for example, would pay explicit homage to various holy women of the diocese of Li[egrave]ge.[83] It would be natural for Conrad to conceive of Caesarius as the right person to cast Elisabeth's spiritual odyssey into a compelling and recognizable narrative of sanctity. Caesarius, was, in turn, a shrewd enough appraiser of the controversial nature of Conrad's reputation to recognize that a depiction of the latter's methods—whether as spiritual director or as inquisitor—required considerable address.

Caesarius's presentation of Conrad does not seek to mollify the reader through extensive apologies or justifications. On the contrary, Caesarius's account is a terse, but powerful, celebration of inquisitorial power over heretics and saints alike. This is apparent from the first mention of Conrad, which is, in many ways, precipitous. Most of the early lives of Elisabeth are reshapings of the testimony of the four handmaidens, and Caesarius's is no exception. Thus in his near verbatim repetition of Guda's account of Elisabeth's childhood, Caesarius includes the identifying comment that "this was the same Guda" who, along with Elisabeth, was later to receive religious garb from Conrad. The gratuitous mention of Conrad occasions a break from the hitherto chronological narration. "This was the same Conrad, an exceptionally literate man very famous in preaching, who was the most bitter inveigher against vices and heretics, the terror of tyrants and heretics, who, when they began to come forth or to show themselves more as a result of his preaching, [became] their tireless persecutor."[84] Caesarius proceeds to recount the succession of papal authorizations that Conrad received, discussed earlier. This frank display of Conrad's qualifications and increasing power is juxtaposed with the ascetic humility of his life. Traveling throughout Germany in a tiny mule cart, Conrad was continually followed by "an innumerable throng," drawn by his powerful preaching and the "great indulgences" he wielded. A description of Conrad's absolute poverty and pronounced ascetical practices prefaces that of his influence over Ludwig and Elisabeth, who "were ruled by [Conrad's] counsel in all things concerning spiritual matters, from whom the same Elisabeth, after the death of her spouse, received the habit of religion just as she also promised obedience to her spiritual father."[85] This allusion to Elisabeth's vow of obedience, a model of orthodox submission, is

followed immediately by an account of the heretical subversion that led to Conrad's demise: "Conrad, burning with the zeal of faith, cleared the field of the church from encroaching tares not only through extirpating heresies through teaching but also by collecting heretics in bunches for burning (Matt. 13.13). By some of these, whom he accused [*defamavit*] of heresy, he was cruelly killed." This excursus on Conrad's career ends with Caesarius's resolution of "return[ing] our inquiry to the sequence of events."[86]

Underlying the portrayal of Conrad as the austere persecutor of heretics is the tacit contention that Conrad's zeal for purging the church was at one with the zeal with which he disciplined his holy charge, Elisabeth. Thus when the subject of Elisabeth's floggings by Conrad is first broached, it is accompanied by this reflection: "For the same Conrad, just as we all know, was a rigid and austere man, wherefore he was feared by many—especially on account of his authority conceded to him by the highest apostle, which he did not neglect to exercise."[87] Here Conrad's papal appointments as inquisitor and as confessor merge, both evincing a similar fear from the very different parties subjected to this mandate.

PROVEN LIKE GOLD IN A FURNACE

> Afflicted in few things, in many they [the just] shall be well rewarded: because God hath tried them,
>
> and found them worthy of himself. As gold in the furnace
>
> he hath proved them, and as a victim of a holocaust
>
> he hath received them.
>
> (Wis. 3.5–6)
>
> It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of
>
> the living God.
>
> (Heb. 10.31)

Caesarius attempted to align aspects of Elisabeth's life with select biblical and patristic models that would imbue her struggles with a pristine dignity and authority. Certain paradigms immediately suggest themselves. Not surprisingly, he repeatedly compares her to the good wife of Proverbs 31. Likewise, Elisabeth's exemplification of active charity within the context of a contemplative life evokes the analogy of Mary and Martha.[88] Caesarius further associates Elisabeth with the kind of substitutive white martyrdom fruitfully employed by James of Vitry and Thomas of Cantimpre è , citing Gregory the Great's reflection on how martyrdom can be achieved through alternative means, such as self-maceration or compassion toward one's

neighbor.[89] Yet after Ludwig's death, the primary and most powerful motif enlisted is what Thomas of Cantimpréhad referred to earlier as purgative probation. As was already evident in James of Vi-try's life of Mary of Oignies, this biblical image likens the various trials to which the just person is subjected to the proving of gold in a furnace as a means of assessing its purity. This analogy is animated by one of the precious metal's most celebrated, if contradictory, attributes: its unchanging nature and its ability to improve under seemingly deleterious conditions. Such qualities are further sustained by classical tradition. According to Pliny, "gold is the only thing that loses no substance by the action of fire, but even in conflagrations and on funeral pyres receives no damage. Indeed as a matter of fact it improves in quality the more often it is fired, and fire serves as a test of its goodness, making it assume a similar hue and itself becoming the colour of fire."[90] Likewise, a saint, subjected to parallel trials, will emerge unscathed, or even stronger.

The Book of Job provides a memorable model of how and why God visits his merciless mercy of probation on the just. Job is a good and pious man whom God permits Satan to assay in order to demonstrate his constancy during adversity as well as prosperity. He is suddenly visited with so compelling a configuration of calamities that his closest friends conclude that he is a secret sinner and urge him to seek God's pardon. Protesting his own righteousness, Job asserts that God "has tried [*probavit*] me as gold that passeth through the fire" (Job 23.10). In his extensive *Moralia* on Job, Gregory the Great will suitably gloss Job's comment, explaining that "gold advances to the clarity of its nature, while losing its filth. Therefore like gold passing through fire, the soul of a just person is proved, from whom vices are extracted and merits increased by the conflagration of tribulation." In Job's case, however, Gregory notes that he was called "just" before God's "scourges" (*flagella*) were applied, which implies that there were no vices to be eliminated, only merits to be augmented. Even so, Gregory clearly envisages a scenario in which the just achieve their true nature, ever present but effaced or in need of development, only through suffering.[91] Later in the same work, Gregory would again compare God's "scourges" to the testing of gold (Wis. 3.6), stressing that it is only through extreme adversity that the strengths of an individual are revealed.[92] Thus Aquinas would emphasize that the story of Job concerned God's affliction of an already perfect man. But even as the probationary fire is operative in manifesting to humanity gold's true virtue, Job's adversities were necessary for revealing his true metal to society at large. God himself did not need such assurances.[93] The need for external proof would be particularly pressing in the High Middle Ages, when the papacy's official role in

both assessing and then revealing a holy person's inner virtues was progressively stressed.

The codependency of virtue and tribulation raises some interesting questions about the identity of the actual agents of persecution. In the story of Job it is Satan who administers the various scourges prepared for Job's probation. Indeed, as Gregory the Great emphasizes, Satan does nothing by his own initative, relying solely on God's permission. Thus Gregory concludes with the reflection that although Satan's will is necessarily wicked, the power he exercises is never unjust, as it comes directly from God.[94] Satan would, in turn, utilize human agents in the pursuit of his persecutory ends, even though they were generally unaware that they were enlisted in diabolical service. For instance, Job's friends, who could not but mistrust his protestations of innocence, inadvertently contributed to his sufferings. Although an argument could be made that they played an estimable role in Job's probation and are deserving of praise, and Gregory the Great does present their activities as furthering the divine plan, he casts them as heretics, subordinating them to God's own restive subordinate, Satan.[95] Indeed, for Nicholas of Lyre (d. 1340), their heresy resided in their actually questioning the whole probationary process by doubting that such temporal reversals advance an individual's spiritual progress.[96]

While Caesarius attempts to stabilize Elisabeth's trials in terms of God's proving of the just, the ultimate source of her travails was in constant flux. The image of probation is first introduced in the context of the various persecutions Elisabeth endures at the hands of her husband's vassals, who acted "by the suggestion of Satan, who moved the Lord against the just Job so that he would afflict him without cause (cf. Job. 2.3)."[97] Fortunately, however, Elisabeth was "not consumed in the fire of such great tribulation and such vehement persecution by the vice of impatience, but was proved [*probata*], so as the psalmist said: thou hast tried me by fire; and iniquity was not found in me (Ps. 16.3)."[98] Caesarius especially commends Elisabeth's indomitable cheerfulness throughout the course of her misfortunes, underlining her own awareness of the immense benefits to be accrued through such trials.

> Just as is proved [*probatur*] in divine Scriptures, tribulation with patience gladdens, proves, purges, and glorifies [*letificat, probat, purgat, et glorificat*] the just. . . . That tribulation should prove [*probet*] the just, Ecclesiasticus testifies: For gold and silver are tried [*probatur*] in the fire, but acceptable men, that is, men who are worthy, in the furnace of humiliation (2.5). Also the angel said to Tobias: And because thou wast acceptable to God, it was necessary

> that temptation should prove [*probaret*] thee (Tobias 12.13). How much the patience of blessed Elisabeth was tried through wicked men was said above. That the fire of tribulation purges [*purget*] the just Augustine teaches, saying thus: That what the furnace does to gold, the flail to grain, and the file to iron, so does tribulation act on the just. Just as he [Augustine] also says: The furnace of tribulation burns the wood of vices and purges [*purgat*] the virtues of gold. Whatsoever was burnable in blessed Elisabeth, the fire of tribulation consumed, so that the gold of her merits and virtues shone more fully. That tribulation glorifies the just you have in the psalm, when the Lord says about the just man: I am with him in tribulation, I will deliver him, and I will glorify him (Ps. 90.15). . . . How much Elisabeth is glorified in heaven on account of momentous tribulations, which she endured on earth, the glory of her miracles adequately declares.[99]

Thus the vassals' impulse may spring from evil, but they cannot fail to do good.

The difficulties of discussing Conrad under the rubric of probation are instantly apparent. The very extremity of his disciplinary regime could easily recommend him as someone bent on evil, who only inadvertently exercises God's will. This would be commensurate with the way he is understood in a number of contemporary chronicles. Thus the *Annals of Worms*, for example, heralds Conrad's antiheretical purge as follows: "The most wretched plague and harshest sentence [*sententia durissima*] followed through divine permission." When it was at an end, Germany was likewise said to rejoice in its liberation "from that inordinate and unheard of judgment [*ab isto iudicio enormi et inaudito*]."[100] The *Gesta* of the archbishops of Trier refers to Conrad's death as the end of a great persecution, the like of which had not been witnessed since the time of the heretical emperor Constantius or Julian the Apostate.[101] Certainly Elisabeth's tendency to associate the blows she received from Conrad with those visited on Christ by his tormentors, alluded to above, would lend credence to this perception of Conrad as an evil man whose purgative ministry is purely adventitious.

Caesarius does his best to cushion his old friend from such aspersions, while still implicating him in the salubrious aspects of the purgative process. The discussion of the vassals' abuse, for example, carefully foregrounds the role of God, rather than Satan, as the more immediate agent of persecution. In addition, Conrad's probationary function often remains more implied than overt. Even so, certain tactical adjustments were also deemed necessary. When he cites,

almost verbatim, Isentrud's comment regarding Conrad's efforts at breaking Elisabeth's will in order to test her constancy, he silently substitutes the verb *probare* for its more ambiguous synonym *temptare*, firmly assimilating Conrad's activities with the larger program of probation while purging it of possible diabolical associations.[102] Moreover, an explicatory rationale is also appended: "so that from this her merit would more fully grow in obeying him."[103] Caesarius continues the near verbatim account of the dismissal of Elisabeth's handmaidens, one by one. The narrative is, however, interrupted by two interlocking biblical allusions:

> That strong woman, because she put out her hand to strong things (Prov. 31.19), knowing that Christ, who is the fortitude of God, said: I did not come to do my will, but the will of my father who sent me (John 4.34), sustained all these things without a murmur of the heart and contradictory response.[104]

This nexus of associations implicates Elisabeth in an inescapable web of obediences. The strong woman of Proverbs is the ideal wife, subjected by nuptial coverture, but still tending cheerfully and loyally to her husband's home. More insistent still is the Christological analogy, which likens Elisabeth's wordless compliance with Conrad's will to Christ's pious submission to God. Thus, beginning with the implied temporal control of the husband, Caesarius proceeds to assimilate Conrad's authority to that of the Godhead so that the natural order becomes coextensive with the supernatural.

But aspects of Conrad's disciplinary regime were sufficiently severe to require Caesarius's own brand of purgation via judicious censorship, although the results are mixed. When discussing the dismissal of Elisabeth's attendants, for example, Caesarius deliberately represses the surveillance and espionage function of their replacements (who are more neutrally referred to as *feminae religiosae*). As a result, however, the austerities and blows that attend their arrival, and remain in the narration, necessarily seem unmotivated. Elisabeth's association of these blows with those received by Christ, which would automatically conjure up the agents administering the blows, was, likewise, wisely repressed.[105] Caesarius also styles Conrad as Elisabeth's *institutor* or "teacher," perhaps because medieval pedagogy was frequently sustained by floggings.[106] Finally, when the beatings are again evoked for the final time, Caesarius makes a last-ditch effort to ensure that Conrad's actions are correctly valued, if not fully empathized with: "There is scarcely a doubt but that the austerity of the same Conrad was the occasion of great merit to blessed Elisabeth. For just as she confessed above, she

feared him exceedingly, and fear is a great punishment." 107

If Caesarius did little to disguise the harshness of Conrad's spiritual mentorship, it may have been because the nature of the mentorship fell within a pattern that he recognized and admired. By insisting on the spiritual benefits that Elisabeth derived from her confessor's harshness, Caesarius was automatically aligning their relationship with the ancient model of spiritual direction kept alive in the *Vitae patrum*, a tradition that Caesarius liberally evokes in his sermon written on the occasion of the translation of Elisabeth.[108] John Cassian (d. 435) had urged that the quintessential monastic virtue of discretion can be learned only in the context of humility, which entailed total submission to the judgment of another.[109]

> The first proof of this humility will be if not only everything that is to be done but also everything that is thought of is offered to the inspection of the elders, so that, not trusting in one's own judgment, one may submit in every respect to their understanding and may know how to judge what is good and bad according to what they have handed down. This instruction will not only teach a young man how to walk on the right paths by the true way of discretion but will also preserve him unhurt from all the snares and traps of the enemy. Whoever lives not by his own judgment but by the example of our forebears shall never be deceived.[110]

Cassian then proceeds to argue that spiritual safety resides only in the submission of deeds and thoughts in their entirety to an elder through confession.[111]

The connection between inner probation and outer submission is even more tightly drawn in ascetical writers such as John Climacus (d. ca. 649). Defending the authority of the spiritual director to the utmost, John argues that "having once entered the stadium of holy living and obedience, we can no longer start criticizing the umpire, even if we should notice some faults in him. After all, he is human and if we start making judgments, then our submissiveness earns no profit."[112] This contention is sustained in the face of the most brutal behavior on the part of a given superior. Sometimes the superior may undeservedly berate, falsely accuse, or visit any kind of unwarranted ill-treatment on his charge—all for the latter's spiritual edification. Thus one brother, whose fifteen-year novitiate was punctuated by gratuitous abuse at the hands of practically everyone in the monastery, summarized his situation without rancor: " 'At the time I came into the monastery they told me that those who renounce the world are tested for thirty years. And they are right . . . for gold is not purified unless it has been tested.' "[113]

The same passive acceptance is required from the disciple even if such brutality is simply a function of the superior's own depravity as opposed to his ascetical aspirations for his follower: the latter's obedience should nevertheless remain unquestioning.[114] The abuses of

a spiritual director are referred to as "spiritual cauterizations, or rather purifying flames"[115] —a probationary process that works regardless of the nature of the impetus that actually stokes the flames. Ultimately, the will of God and the superior are represented as inseparable. Indeed, in the furthest reaches of this theme the respective claims of the two are even inverted.

> And what I am going to say to you now must not shock you. . . . It is better to sin against God than against our father. If we make God angry, our director can reconcile Him to us. But if he is angry, then there is no one to speak up for us before God. And in any case, the two situations are really the same. Or so it seems to me.[116]

Such a perspective would acquire new salience in the thirteenth century with the increasing emphasis on the priesthood both as mediators with and representatives of God.

In this pristine model, the debasement of the disciple is proportionate to this unprecedented elevation of the superior. The probations that he visits are, moreover, indistinguishable from the scourges of God. Thus Isidore of Seville (d. 636) tersely distills Gregory the Great's views, "Temporal scourges advance the eternal joys of the just person; and therefore the just person ought to rejoice in his penalties, and the impious to fear his prosperity."[117] In fact, Elisabeth was fully equal to this challenge: Isentrud testifies that, after Elisabeth endured expulsion from the castle and other indignities, she asked the Franciscans to say a *Te Deum* in thanksgiving for her tribulation.[118] In the later expansion of the handmaidens' testimony, immediately after Gregory IX transferred the control of Elisabeth and her finances to Conrad, the following accretion subtly associates her tribulations with Conrad's tutelage: "Rejoicing in all her remembered injuries and afflictions, she gave thanks to God that he frequently deigned to scourge [*flagellare*] her in this manner. For whomever the Lord castigates, he loves (Prov. 3.12; cf. Heb. 12.6)."[119] Conrad's physical chastisements are thus elided with the celebrated scourges of God.

That this was, moreover, commensurate with Conrad's own understanding of his role is suggested by what he chooses to include and what he chooses to repress in his letter to Gregory IX. Although emphasizing Elisabeth's invariable patience under tribulation, he at no time mentions the various depredations she endured at the hands of Ludwig's relatives and vassals, or the gratuitous insults she received from the villagers immediately following her expulsion from the castle.[120] Rather, Conrad dwells exclusively on the trials she sustained at his own hands. His reticence about Elisabeth's other troubles has been interpreted as signifying that Conrad was not interested in detailing secular hardships, devoting himself exclusively to divine

purgations.[121] But if this line of argument is correct, and I believe that it may be in a certain sense, the only divine purgations in question were the ones that Conrad instituted himself. Elisabeth had, in other words, fallen into the hands of a living God.

But Conrad's conception of divinity was remarkably skewed: it is surely significant that he showed little or no interest in the various mystical revelations Elisabeth experienced, a disinvestment that is very uncharacteristic of the spiritual directors to holy women we have seen and will see.[122] Divine scourges, administered by Conrad alone, took precedence over any divine consolations of a mystical nature—consolations that may well have interfered with Conrad's authority.

The beauty of purgative probation lay in its infinite scope and flexibility. Even if Caesarius failed to make a case for Conrad's just treatment of Elisabeth, or if Conrad were depicted as firmly in league with diabolical forces, his actual probationary function does not change. Like the pagan persecutors of the martyrs of old or the motley mechanisms of torment presented by Thomas of Cantimpré, a wicked Conrad would get the job done, perhaps even more effectively than a beneficent one. However, unlike the pagan persecutors or some of Thomas's more ingenious torturers, Conrad represented disciplinary institutions, be they inquisitorial or sacramental, that were constantly gaining ground in terms of official ratification. These factors, in conjunction with the unchallenged prerogatives of the abusive spiritual director portrayed in the *Vitae patrum*, could be used to justify any and all unbridled uses of power. By the fifteenth century, the evil agents responsible for the probation of the just have themselves undergone a progressive purging of negative association. Hence John of Dambach, writing in the increasingly popular genre of spiritual consolation, will interpret temptation and affliction as unequivocal signs of God's grace. He encourages gratitude for such travails since "a proving [*probatio*] of your faith is more precious than the gold that is proved through fire."[123]

The relationship between Conrad and Elisabeth is both an exemplum for the times and a harbinger of things to come. Although an extreme case, it nevertheless functions as a poignant illustration of the vulnerability and malleability of the female penitent before a confessor who stands in the place of God. His bifurcated role in both the internal forum of conscience and the external disciplinary forum, the methods common to each forum, and the traffic between the two: all of these factors illuminate the potential hazards that could arise for women as Christendom's love affair with female spirituality grew cold.

Moreover, the role of the historical Conrad in testing saints and heretics alike represents something of an object lesson concerning not only the difficulties of assessing sanctity and heresy but also the

ambiguous position in which the assessor himself is placed. Probably from the perspective of Gregory IX and most certainly for Conrad's devoted follower Gerhard, Conrad was a holy man. To most of Germany, he was a monster. To Elisabeth, Conrad represented God, but God in his most fearsome and judicial capacity. The extreme volatility of Conrad's reputation is subtly captured by the chronicler Richer, who initially refers to him in benign terms, describing how he "animated the path of salvation daily" for Elisabeth. But this is not the last word. This view is almost immediately challenged in the same chronicle, where Conrad does not fare so well. A conversation is alleged to have occurred between two demoniacs, each of whom had sought Elisabeth's basilica for a cure. To this end, one was attached to the tomb of Elisabeth, the other to the tomb of Conrad. They began to argue the various merits of the penitent versus the confessor in effecting a cure. The one tied to Conrad's tomb aggressively asserted the latter's superiority insofar as he was a man, while Elisabeth was only a woman. Moreover, Conrad was instrumental in Elisabeth's conversion to a quasi-religious life. The one attached to Elisabeth's tomb, however, asserted that Conrad would never be able to cure anyone. Whereas Elisabeth was with God, Conrad "did not thus serve God suitably." A bet ensued, wherein each demoniac asserted that he would be the first to be cured via the intervention of his chosen patron. But when the demoniac attached to Conrad's tomb saw the unclean spirit leave his companion, he began to weep bitterly, begging to be moved to Elisabeth's tomb.[124]

[1] Charlotte Bronteï, *Villette* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), p. 143.

[2] On Beguine devotion to Elisabeth, see Walter Simons, *Cities of Ladies: Beguine Communities in the Medieval Low Countries, 1200–1565* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), pp. 88–89.

[3] See Dietrich of Apolda, *Die Vita der heiligen Elisabeth des Dietrich von Apolda* 1.7, ed. Monika Rener (Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1993), p. 31. Theodoric of Thuringia, *Libri octo de S. Elizabeth* 1.7, in *Thesaurus monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et historicum*, ed. H. Canisius (Antwerp: Rudolph and Gerhard Wetstenios, 1725), 4:21. Also see the addition in the expanded version of the handmaidens' account (A. Huyskens, ed., *Der sog. Libellus de dictis quatuor ancillarum s. Elisabeth confectus* [Kempten and Munich: Jos. Koïsel'schen, 1911], p. 15).

[4] Albert Huyskens, ed., *Quellenstudien zur Geschichte der hl. Elisabeth Landgräfin von Thüringen* (Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche, 1908), p. 117.

[5] Dietrich of Apolda, *Vita* 4.6, pp. 70–71. Note that, according to Isentrud, Elisabeth testified to her great love at Ludwig's funeral, adding that she did not begrudge God for taking Ludwig away. But her resignation to God's will was misunderstood and soon gave rise to the malicious rumor that she did not care for husband (Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, pp. 124, 125). Frequently the husband's death is depicted as something of a relief in the lives of holy matrons. See Dyan Elliott, *Spiritual Marriage: Sexual Abstinence in Medieval Wedlock* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993), p. 235.

[6] See Isentrud's testimony, Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 116.

[7] Ibid., pp. 115, 116. Ludwig condoned Elisabeth's and her maids' food abstention, claiming that he would do likewise if it would not scandalize his family. Also see Theodoric of Thuringia, *Libri octo* 2.6, 4:125. Note that when Ludwig refused to put Elisabeth aside, he replighted his troth by sending her a small image of the crucifixion (Dietrich of Apolda, *Vita* 1.7, pp. 31–32). Conrad of Marburg will later write to Gregory IX that Elisabeth complained to him, while Ludwig was still alive, how she regretted not having preserved her virginity. Considering her devotion to Ludwig, this seems far-fetched—less a literal truth than an indication of the extent to which intact virginity, even on an aspirational level, was still important to the female profile of sanctity (Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 156). Caesarius of Heisterbach likewise alleges that Elisabeth married "against the desire of her heart," *Vita sancte Elyzabeth langravie*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften über die hl. Elisabeth von Thüringen," ed. Albert Huyskens, *Annalen des historischen Vereins fuïr den Niederrhein* 86 (1908): 24. Roma (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1979), 1:367–80. Other key documents include Conrad of Marburg's letter to Gregory IX describing the saint's life, which was sent to Rome as a preface to the account of her miracles (Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, pp. 155–60), and an anonymous account of her death, written in Marburg immediately thereafter (ibid., pp. 148–49). Also see the writings of Caesarius of Heisterbach, who produced a sermon at the time of her translation—the ceremonial transfer of her remains (*Sermo de translacione beate Elysabeth*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," pp. 51–59), and a vita in 1237 (pp. 17–50). There is also an anonymous life, written between 1236 and 1239 and edited by Diodorus Henniges: "Vita S. Elisabeth, Langraviae Thuringiae," *AFH* 2 (1909): 250–68. The later lives of Theodoric of Thuringia (1289) and Dietrich of Apolda (1297) are largely based on these earlier sources. See n. 3, above.

[8] The official text of the process for canonization has disappeared, but enough remains that the dossier can be roughly reconstructed. Most of the pertinent documents have been edited by Huyskens in *Quellenstudien*. The central text, which proved crucial to subsequent lives of Elisabeth, derives from a papal inquiry of 1235 based on the testimonies of the four female servants who had known and served Elisabeth since her marriage. (Guda had known Elisabeth from infancy.) See Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, pp. 112–40. The expanded version of the original testimony, "The Book of the Four Handmaidens," was completed before 1241 (Huyskens, *Der sog. Libellus*. Also see the fragment of this latter work recently discovered and edited by G. G. Meersseman, "Le deposizioni delle compagne di S. Elisabetta di Turingia in un frammento conservato nell'archivio di stato a Friburgo," in *Palaeographica diplomatica et archivistica: studi in onore di Giulio Battelli*, ed. Scuola speciale archivisiti e bibliotecari dell'Universit[agrave]di

[9] Balthasar Kaltner, *Konrad von Marburg und die Inquisition in Deutschland* (Prague: F. Tempsky, 1882), pp. 98–99.

[10] Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Vita*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," pp. 24–25. The reference to Conrad's correction of morals refers to his efforts at church reform that were, again, encouraged by Gregory IX. See, for example, Gregory's letter regarding clerical concubinage in Germany, in Auvray, 20 June 1227, no. 113. Also see Lea, *Inquisition*, 2:330–34; Kaltner, *Konrad*, pp. 106–7.

[11] The name Conrad is mentioned at the end of *Dialogus miraculorum* 3.16, but the trials are described in 3.17 (ed. Joseph Strange [Cologne, Bonn, Brussels: J. M. Heberle, 1851], 1:32; trans. H. Von E. Scott and C. C. Swinton Bland, *The Dialogue on Miracles* [London: Routledge, 1929], 1:149–50). John

Trithemius, though admittedly late (ca. 1500), claims that this was, in fact, Conrad of Marburg. He also dates the persecution of Strasbourg as 1215, further arguing that Conrad used the ordeal in defiance of Lateran IV (*Annales Hirsaugienses complectens historiam Franciae et Germaniae* ann. 1215 [Saint Gall: Monastery of Saint Gall, 1690], 2:525). Kaltner notes, however, that the persecution in Strasbourg would have occurred around 1212, so that even if the cleric in question was Conrad, he was not contravening Lateran IV's ban on ordeals (*Konrad*, pp. 82–84).

12 Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Vita*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," p. 23, also n. 14, below. Cf. Dietrich of Apolda, *Vita* 3.8, p. 59. Conrad is consistently referred to as "Magister" by Gregory IX in the correspondence discussed below.

13 Kaltner, *Konrad*, pp. 74–75.

14 Ibid., pp. 76–78. Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Vita*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," p. 24. Richer's *Gesta Senoniensis ecclesiae* (between 1254 and 1264) refers to Conrad as a Franciscan, perhaps because of Elisabeth's own patronage of the order (ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS*, 25:319). But the Dominican claim seems to have won out. See Trithemius's assertion in *Annales Hirsaugienses* ann. 1215, 2:525. Thus Thomas of Cantimpréreports in his alleged history of the order that Master Conrad, "preaching in Germany against the heretics, perish[ed] in a happy death through them," although he never explicitly says that Conrad was a Dominican (*De apibus* 2.57.23, p. 553). But Colvener, the sixteenth-century editor of Thomas of Cantimpré's *De apibus*, notes that subsequent chroniclers do make this claim (see the notes to 2.57.23, pp. 155–56). Moreover, Conrad is listed in Colvener's index as the first martyr of the Dominicans. Also see Karl Hermann May's argument for a possible Premonstratensian connection, in "Zur Geschicte Konrads von Marburg," *Hessisches Jahrbuch fuïr Landesgeschichte* 1 (1951): 89–101.

15 Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 135. This is according to Irmingard's testimony.

16 Cf. Kaltner, *Konrad*, pp. 116–17.

17 Ibid., p. 112. For the various persecutions on behalf of her in-laws, see Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, pp. 121–22; idem, *Der sog. Libellus*, pp. 145–46; Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Vita*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," p. 34.

18 Only one letter remains, which was copied at the back of a psalter and discovered in 1904.

This has been edited by Karl Wenck, with an introduction and German translation as, "Die heilige Elisabeth und Papst Gregor IX," *Hochland* 2 (1907): 128–48. In this letter, Gregory alludes to earlier communications (p. 145).

19 See the expanded version of the original account of the four handmaidens (Huyskens, *Die sog. Libellus*, pp. 45–46). Also see Kaltner, *Konrad*, p. 113.

20 Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, pp. 114, 125. This is according to Isentrud's testimony. For Elisabeth's prayers for assistance in giving up her property and feeling no greater love for her children than for other people, see ibid., p. 126. Irmingard also recounts that she ordered her child of a year and a half to be removed from her, lest she be turned from God's service (ibid., p. 137). In an anonymous letter describing Elisabeth's death, one of the earliest contemporary sources advancing her sanctity, Elisabeth herself is described as reminding Conrad that with the vow of obedience she renounced not only her will but her children, her corporeal and worldly desire, and worldly possessions—with the exception of those necessary for paying debts and distributing alms. These latter resources, moreover, were retained only at Conrad's behest, and she

would gladly have given them up as well in order to enter a cell as an anchoress (p. 148). Cf. Conrad's letter to Gregory IX, ibid., p. 157. Although Elisabeth's gray tunic has subsequently been associated with the Franciscan order, there is no evidence for this claim. She was probably not officially affiliated with any order (see Edith Pa è sztor's "Elisabetta di Turingia," in *BS*, col. 1121).

21 See her maid Isentrud's account in Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, pp. 115–16.

22 For the bull *Gloriam virginalem*, see Auvray, 30 May 1233, no. 1361.

23 Conrad's letter to Gregory IX makes reference to Raymond's repeated urgings (Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, pp. 155–56). The delays seem to have been due to Conrad's desire to ensure the presence of the archbishop of Mainz, who was expected to visit on the feast of Saint Lawrence in order to consecrate two altars to Elisabeth in her basilica at Marburg. Probably without first consulting the archbishop, Conrad preached a sermon on Elisabeth's virtues in which he called on the witnesses to her miracles to testify the next day. Not only were many of the witnesses unable to get through the press of people, but the archbishop was in a hurry. Moreover, neither he nor the other ecclesiastics in attendance had brought their seals, and they were hence unable to signify their presence and support legally (See Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, introd., pp. 79–80; Kaltner, *Konrad*, pp. 122 ff.). On other forces promoting Elisabeth's cult, see Michael Goodich's "The Politics of Canonization in the Thirteenth Century: Lay and Mendicant Saints," in *Saints and Their Cults*, ed. Stephen Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 171–72.

24 Auvray, 13 October 1232, no. 913. Also see Kaltner, *Konrad*, pp. 123–24 and nn. 2–3; and AndréVauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*, trans. Jean Birrell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 59 nn. 69–70.

25 See Gregory's letter to Beatrice, queen of Castile, that discusses the conversion of Elisabeth's brother-in-law, Conrad of Thuringia (Auvray, 7 June 1235, no. 2648). He allegedly went to Elisabeth's tomb seeking an end to the horrible fleshly lusts in which he was ensnared, and he was miraculously freed of all such temptations. This precipitated his conversion (see Huyskens, *Der sog. Libellus*, pp. 84–85; Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Vita*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," p. 39; cf. Dietrich of Apolda, *Vita* 8.9, pp. 116–17). In his sermon on Saint Elisabeth, Caesarius recounts how Conrad of Thuringia personally approached the pope regarding her canonization (*Sermo de translacione*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," p. 54). Conrad of Thuringia also gave the celebratory dinner for the various religious in the wake of Elisabeth's canonization (see *Processus et ordo canonizationis*, in Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 146).

26 See Auvray, 11 October 1234, no. 2114, for his directions to the bishop of Hildesheim, and various other religious authorities, to undertake an inquisition regarding Elisabeth's miracles. The canonization was effected by the bull *Gloriosus in maiestate sua*. See Auvray, 1 June 1235, no. 2600. Cf. the account that was probably written by Raymond of Peñafort, *Processus et ordo canonizationis*, in Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, pp. 142–45.

27 On this ceremony, see chap. 4, pp. 140–41, below. On his Constitutions of Melfi of 1231, see Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:221, 227, 320, 2:148, 198, 199, and David Abulafia, *Frederick II: A Medieval Emperor* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 211–13.

28 See Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, pp. 142–46. On Raymond's probable authorship, see ibid., introd., pp. 29–30.

29 Gregory granted only forty days indulgence for pilgrimages to the tomb of Virgil of Salzburg (d. 784), who was canonized two years later (Vauchez,

Sainthood, p. 74 n. 37).

30 Huyskens, *Der sog. Libellus*, pp. 45–46.

31 Nicholas Aragonius, *Vita Gregorii Papae IX*, *RIS*, 3,1:580.

32 See Elliott, *Spiritual Marriage*, pp. 156–57.

33 Raymond of Peñafort, *Summa de poenitentia et matrimonio* 3.33.4 (Rome: Joannes Tallini, 1603), p. 383; Aquinas, *ST* 3a, q. 85, art. 2, resp., 60:56–59. See Elliott, *Spiritual Marriage*, pp. 187–88.

34 This association is very ancient. On nuptial veiling and the consecration of virgins in the West, see Raymond D'Izarny, "Mariage et consécration virginale au IVe sie`cle," *La Vie spirituelle* supp. 6 (1953): 92–118. Cf. parallels with consecrated widows, in Mary Erler, "English Vowed Women at the End of the Middle Ages," *Mediaeval Studies* 57 (1995): 155–204. On some of the symbolic ramifications, see Nancy Warren, *Spiritual Economies: Female Monasticism in Later Medieval England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), pp. 4–9, 87, 25–29.

35 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania 35 See chap. 2, p. 55, above, and chap. 5, n. 135, below.

36 This stricture is already present in the so-called first rule, although the actual text that Francis presented to Innocent III has not survived. See Cajetan Esser, ed., *Opuscula sancti patris Francisci* (Grottaferrata, Rome: College of Saint Bonaventure, 1978), c. 12, p. 265. Also see Donato Soliman, *Il ministero della confessione nella legislazione dei Frati Minori*, Studi e Testi Francescani, no. 28 (Rome: Edizione Francescane, 1964), p. 145.

37 See n. 20, above. The expanded version of the four handmaidens' testimony also stresses Conrad's control over Elisabeth's property (Huyskens, *Der sog. Libellus*, p. 50). On the church's protection of the widow as *miserabilis persona*, see James Brundage, "Widows as Disadvantaged Persons in Medieval Canon Law," in *Upon My Husband's Death: Widows in the Literature and Histories of Medieval Europe*, ed. Helen Mirren (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), pp. 193–206.

38 Conrad writes to Gregory IX that Elisabeth followed him to Marburg, even though he alleges his own disapproval of her move. Marburg was at the farthest reaches of her husband's land (Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 158).

39 See Isentrud's testimony in ibid., pp. 115–16. Though Elisabeth used her dowry to supplement Ludwig's table with permitted food for herself and her attendants, she often needed to feign eating in order to avert scandal. Her careful efforts to distinguish between permissible and impermissible food correspond closely to the kind of advice given to the wives of usurers in confessors' manuals. See, for example, Robert of Courson's manual, written between 1204 and 1210, which urged the usurer's wife to reject the tainted food of her husband's board in favor of sustenance purchased from her own dowry. Failing that, she should employ a psychic "winnowing instrument" (*uentilabrum*) to distinguish licit from illicit goods, partaking only of the former. See V. L. Kennedy's edition of the manual in "Robert of Courson on Penance" c. 10, *Mediaeval Studies* 7 (1945): 319–20. Also see Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 135–36. Note that Christina Mirabilis allegedly experienced excruciating pain if she inadvertently partook of food of suspect origins (*VCM*, p. 654; trans. King, p. 15).

40 For Conrad's interference, see Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 137. Also see the section in his letter to Gregory cited below. Cf. Dietrich of Apolda, *Vita* 7.4, pp. 100–101. On the husband's interference with the wife's alms, and the wife's

special permission to circumvent this interference, see Elliott, *Spiritual Marriage*, pp. 189–90; eadem, "Dress as Mediator between Inner and Outer Self: The Pious Matron of the High and Later Middle Ages," *Mediaeval Studies* 53 (1991): 279–308, esp. 297–99 for Ludwig's alleged interference.

[41] Dietrich of Apolda, *Vita* 2.7, pp. 40–41.

[42] Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, pp. 158–59. The leper was instantly supplanted by a poor scabby child who had hardly any hair on his head.

[43] Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Vita*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," p. 24. On traditional burial practices which presuppose that spouses will be buried together, see Gratian, C. 13 q. 2 c. 2–3. Note, however, that this is not obligatory (C. 13 q. 2 c. 3 dpc).

[44] Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 135.

[45] This comment was made by an unidentified bishop present at the council, the activities of which are reported by *Chronicon Erfordiense*, ed. G. H. Pertz, *MGH SS*, 16:29; also in Mansi, vol. 23, col. 334.

[46] Dietrich of Apolda, *Vita* 6.1, p. 87; 6.3, p. 88; 7.1, p. 97. Dietrich notes in his prologue to this life that Conrad's letter to Gregory IX was one of his sources (p. 21).

[47] Kaltner, *Konrad*, pp. 104–6. See Auvray, 12 June 1227 (bis), nos. 108, 109. For Gregory IX's antiheretical policy in Germany, see Henri Maissoneuve, *Etudes sur les origines de l'Inquisition*, 2d ed. (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1960), pp. 257–64.

[48] See, for example, Charles Homer Haskins, "Robert le Bougre and the Beginnings of the Inquisition in Northern France," in *Studies in Mediaeval Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929), p. 208; cf. M.-H. Vicaire's debunking of efforts to construct Dominic as the first inquisitor, in " 'Persequutor Hereticorum' ou les 'Persécutions' de Saint Dominique," *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 6 (1971): 75–84.

[49] See particularly Ludwig Foïrg, *Die Ketzerverfolgung in Deutschland unter Gregor IX*, vol. 218 of *Historische Studien* (Berlin: Emil Ebering, 1932), pp. 71–72, 74, 80. Also see Richard Kieckhefer, *The Repression of Heresy in Medieval Germany* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979), pp. 14–15.

[50] *Gestorum Treverorum continuatio quarta*, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS*, 24:400. See Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:322, 336. The vernacular *Historia regum francorum* by Philip Mouket (fl. 1236) also notes that Conrad and his companion carried letters from Rome (ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGH SS*, 26:804). See Caesarius of Heisterbach's introduction of Conrad, cited above, and Dietrich of Apolda, *Vita* 3.8, p. 59.

[51] See Auvray, 10 June 1233, no. 1387; Kaltner, *Konrad*, pp. 134–36; Lea, *Inquisition*, 2:332.

[52] *Annales Wormatiensis*, ed. G. H. Pertz, *MGH SS*, 17:39.

[53] *Gestorum Treverorum continuatio quarta*, *MGH SS*, 24:400–440, trans. *WE*, pp. 267–68. *Annales Wormatiensis*, *MGH SS*, 17:39; *Chronicon Erfordiense* ann. 1234, *MGH SS*, 16:28. Cf. Albric's *Chronicon*, discussed below. See Kaltner, *Konrad*, pp. 154–59; Foïrg, *Die Ketzerverfolgung*, pp. 75 ff.; and Lea, *Inquisition*, 2:338 ff.

[54] Lea, *Inquisition*, 2:336. Lea also notes that the shaving of heads corresponds to the later imposition of crosses that were to be worn by alleged heretics.

[55] Cf. Robert le Bougre's career, wherein parallel abuses of power led to his fall. See chap. 2, n. 94, above; and chap. 5, p. 229, below.

[56] See J. F. Boïhmer and C. Will, eds., *Regesta Archiepiscoporum Maguntinensium* ann. 1233 (Innsbruck: Wagner, 1886), 2:227; Trithemius,

Annales Hirsaugienses ann. 1233, 2:537–38; cf. the *Annales Wormatiensis*, *MGH SS*, 17:39; *Gestorum Treverorum continuatio quarta*, *MGH SS*, 24:402.

[57] For accounts of Gregory's reaction, ranging from cryptically resigned to unrestrainably out-raged, see *Annales Wormatiensis*, *MGH SS*, 17:40; *Chronicon Erfordiense*, *MGH SS*, 16:28–29.

[58] 23 October 1233, printed in *MGH Ep. Saec. XIII*, ed. C. Rodenberg, no. 560, 1:453; Auvray, no. 1571. Also see 31 October 1233, no. 1581; 26 July 1235, no. 2700; 31 July 1235, no. 2701. This evocation of Jeremiah was not exclusive to Conrad's death. Gregory had already employed it in a series of letters dating from June 1233, demarcating the sufferings of the church at the hands of heretics (see Auvray, nos. 1391–94). When applied to Conrad, both the lamentation and the allusion to the death of innocent victims acquire heightened significance and irony.

[59] *MGH Ep. Saec. XIII*, no. 560, 1:454–55.

[60] *Albrici monachi Triumfontium Chronicon* ann. 1233, ed. P. Scheffer-Boichorst, *MGH SS*, 23:931–32. Cf. the *Gestorum Treverorum continuatio quarta*, which also refers to converted heretics launching false accusations and the incumbent deaths of many innocent people (in *MGH SS*, 24:400–401).

[61] Cf. *Annales Wormatiensis* (ann. 1231), which notes that many of the victims died invoking Jesus and the saints (*MGH SS*, 17:39). For other instances of "heretical" martyrs, see chap. 4, pp. 174–79, below.

[62] *Albrici monachi Triumfontium Chronicon* ann. 1233, *MGH SS*, 23:931–32.

[63] Innocent III had already, in 1200, canonized Empress Cunegund, who was allegedly a virginal matron (see Elliott, *Spiritual Marriage*, pp. 196, 266; for her legend, see pp. 119–20, 129–30).

[64] See Irmingard's testimony, Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 129.

[65] Ibid., p. 139. This was according to Irmingard's testimony.

[66] See Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Sermo de translacione*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," p. 52.

[67] See Huyskens's introduction to *Quellenstudien*, pp. 80–81.

[68] *MGH Ep. Saec. XIII*, no. 5603, 1:454; Auvray, 23 October 1233, no. 1571.

[69] Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 135. This is according to Irmingard's testimony.

[70] Ibid., p. 159; Henniges, "Vita S. Elisabeth," pp. 256, 265.

[71] Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, pp. 143–44.

[72] Ibid., p. 126. This corresponds to what Guda reported about the child Elisabeth, who would intentionally deny herself pleasure, "breaking her own will for God," p. 113.

[73] Ibid., pp. 135–36; Kaltner, *Konrad*, p. 119. Cf. an instance during Ludwig's lifetime when Elisabeth was impeded from attending Conrad's sermon by the presence of a visiting noble. Because of her inobedience, Conrad resigned as her spiritual director. When Elisabeth and her maidens hastened to submit themselves to Conrad, groveling at his feet, Conrad had them stripped to their undergarments and whipped (Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, pp. 118–19). Lea posits that secular individuals were not permitted to enter the cloister, and this occasioned Elisabeth's excommunication (Lea, *Inquisition*, 2:328). But there is nothing in the text to suggest that the excommunication was contingent on anything except her purported disobedience to Conrad; cf. Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Vita*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," pp. 45–46. Such arbitrary excommunications contravene the recent stipulations of Lateran IV (c. 47), which forbade excommunication without sufficient warning and "manifest and reasonable cause" (Tanner, 1:255–56). Caesarius of Heisterbach reports that Conrad's assassins were prepared to spare Gerhard, but he preferred to die

with Conrad (*Vita*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," p. 24).

74 Thomas suspected his penitent's complicity with the incubus who was violating her. In his own words: "I marveled especially by what judgment omnipotent God would have permitted this in an unconsenting soul. I in no way wanted to believe this, so I called the virgin to testify with dreadful oaths [*horrificis iuramentis*], and finally extorted from her violently [*ab ea violenter extorsi*] that she was first corrupted in the mind and then in the flesh. And see how hidden and marvelous is [God's] judgment of justice" (*De apibus* 2.57.14, p. 546). The woman was freed from the incubus only through the intervention of Lutgard (2.57.15, p. 547). See Barbara Newman's discussion "Possessed by the Spirit: Devout Women, Demoniacs, and the Apostolic Life in the Thirteenth Century," *Speculum* 73 (1998): 743–44, and Dyan Elliott, *Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), pp. 54–55. Cf. Thomas's rather heavy-handed joke, again involving an oath, this time extracted from a woman who had injured a cleric making advances toward her (*De apibus* 2.30.51, p. 356).

75 On Conrad Dorso and John's activities, see *Annales Wormatiensis* ann. 1231, *MGH SS*, 17:38–39. According to this account, these two men approached Conrad to further their activities because of his reputation as "a judge without mercy." The annals further claim that Dorso was killed in Strasbourg, even as John was hanged in Friedberg. Also see the *Gestorum Treverorum continuatio quarta*, in *MGH SS*, 24:400. Cf. Lea, *Inquisition*, 2:333–34; Kaltner, *Konrad*, pp. 138–40.

76 Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 126.

77 Ibid., p. 127. See Conrad's admission to Gregory of beating Elisabeth when she secretly harbored an indigent leper (pp. 94–95, above). Cf. an anonymous life, Henniges, "Vita S. Elisabeth," p. 256.

78 Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 158. Conrad describes them in terms of Elisabeth's spiritual profit but does not mention their espionage.

79 ". . . quod castra sua, que erant peroptima, ipsi cum veteris mulieribus vellent auferre et inquirere," *Annales Wormatiensis* ann. 1231, *MGH SS*, 17:39.

80 Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 158.

81 See chap. 1, pp. 19–20, above.

82 See Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Vita*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," p. 17; also see Kaltner, *Konrad*, p. 122.

83 See, for example, Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum* 7.3, 11.28–29, 2:4, 294–95; trans. Scott and Bland, 1:457, 2:262–64. Also see Caesarius's anecdote regarding the false shepherd that was probably based upon an episode from *VMO* discussed in chap. 6, n. 82, below.

84 Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Vita*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," pp. 24–25. The reference to Conrad's correction of morals refers to his efforts at church reform that were, again, encouraged by Gregory IX. See, for example, Gregory's letter regarding clerical concubinage in Germany in Auvray, 20 June 1227, no. 113. Also see Lea, *Inquisition*, 2:329–30; Kaltner, *Konrad*, pp. 106–7.

85 Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Vita*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," p. 24.

86 Ibid., p. 24.

87 Ibid., p. 31.

88 For the good wife of Proverbs, see ibid., p. 39, pp. 41–42 (four times); also cf. the related references to prudent wives from the Old Testament, on p. 25. Note that, when describing Elisabeth's efforts at getting other women to give up fine clothing and dancing, an endeavor that was present in the original

handmaidens' account, Caesarius adds a gratuitous reference to Paul's insistence that wives be subordinate to their husbands (p. 29). For comparisons to Martha and Mary, see pp. 37, 47.

89 Ibid., pp. 28–29.

90 Pliny, *Natural History* 33.19, ed. and trans. H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heineman, 1968), 9:46–49. These views were, of course, carried forward into the Middle Ages. Cf. Isidore of Seville on *obryzum*, in *Etymologiae* 16.18.2, *PL* 82, col. 584. Gold's reputed purity fostered the belief that it could cure any number of physical ailments. Its curative powers are summarized by Vincent of Beauvais in his *Speculum naturale* 7.4–5, in *Speculum quadruplex; sive Speculum maius* (Douai: B. Belleri, 1624), 1:427–28.

91 Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 16.32.39, ed. Mark Adriaen, *CCSL* 143a (Turnhout: Brepols, 1979), p. 822. Cf. the *Glossa ordinaria* for Job 23.10, ad v. *probavit*, vol. 3, fol. 47v.

92 Gregory the Great, *Moralia* 23.26.52, *CCSL* 143b, p. 1186.

93 Thomas Aquinas, *Expositio in librum beati Job*, in *Opera omnia* (Parma: Petrus Fiaccadori, 1863), prologue, 14:1; c. 23, lect. 1, for verse 23, ad v. *Et probabit me quasi aurum, quod per ignem transit*, 14:87.

94 Gregory the Great, *Moralia* 2.10.16–17, *CCSL* 143, p. 70.

95 See, for example, Gregory the Great, *Moralia* 5.12.29 ff., *CCSL* 143, pp. 238 ff.; 16.16.21, *CCSL* 143a, pp. 810–11.

96 See Nicholas of Lyre's *Postilla* for Job 9.18, ad v. *et implet me amaritudinibus*, in *Glossa ordinaria*, vol. 3, fol. 25r.

97 Caesarius's subtle portraiture of Elisabeth as a female Job complements Ann Astell's argument for the feminization of Job by writers such as Gregory I and Chaucer ("Translating Job as Female," in *Translation Theory and Practice in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jeanette Beer [Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, 1997], pp. 59–69).

98 Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Vita*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," p. 34.

99 Ibid., pp. 35–36.

100 *Annales Wormatiensis*, *MGH SS*, 17:38, 40.

101 *Gestorum Treverorum continuatio quarta*, *MGH SS*, 24:402.

102 Despite the frequent biblical association of the verb *temptare* (or the variant spelling, *tentare*) with God (see Exod. 16.4; Deut. 8.2; 1 Cor. 10.13, etc.), the verb is nevertheless more weighted with diabolical associations than is *probare*. Cf. Aquinas's question as to whether temptation is the special job of the devil, in chap. 6, p. 238, below.

103 Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Vita*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," p. 38; cf. Isentrud's testimony in Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 126.

104 Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Vita*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," p. 39.

105 Ibid., p. 39.

106 Ibid., prol., pp. 17, 38.

107 Ibid., p. 46.

108 Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Sermo de translacione*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften," pp. 52–53.

109 By citing a series of monastic catastrophes, Cassian demonstrates how Satan could lead ascetics into serious or even fatal error (several brethren were tempted to commit suicide) if the said individuals failed to discern the true nature of their spiritual impulses (John Cassian, *Conf è rences* 2.5–8, ed. and trans. E. Pichery, *SC* 42 [Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1955], 1:116–19; trans. Boniface Ramsey, *Conferences* [New York: Paulist Press, 1997], pp. 87–90). The

term *discretio* can be translated as either discernment or discretion, two meanings that were seen to be interrelated. In the early church, discernment of spirits comes to be overshadowed by a view of discretion that was essentially synonymous with "prudence" in scholastic theology. See Augusta Raabe, "Discernment of Spirits in the Prologue to the *Rule* of Benedict," *American Benedictine Review* 23 (1972): 399–403; cf. Regis Appel, "Cassian's *Discretio*—A Timeless Virtue," *American Benedictine Review* 17 (1966): 24–27.

110 Cassian, *Conf è rences* 2.10, *SC*, no. 42, 1: 120; trans. Ramsey, pp. 90–91.

111 Cassian, *Conf è rences* 2.13, *SC*, no. 42, 1:124–26; trans. Ramsey, pp. 94–95. Cassian does admit, however, that such trust in submission is often disappointed, exemplifying this with a tale of an elder who reproved a young man so harshly concerning his sexual temptations that the youth was left in a state of dangerous despondency. When Abba Apollo, the most proven of the elders (*seniorum probatissiumus*), learned of the reason for the youth's despair, he successfully prayed that the ungenerous confessor (who had himself never truly been tested) be tormented by similar temptations. The Abba cites Job 5.18 on the relationship between divine hitting and healing (Cassian, *Conf è rences* 2.13, *SC*, no. 42, 1:126–29; trans. Ramsey, pp. 95–98).

112 John Climacus, *Scala paradisi*, step 4, *PG* 88, cols. 679–80; trans. Colm Luibheid and Norman Russell, *The Ladder of Divine Ascent* (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), pp. 92–93.

113 John Climacus, *Scala paradisi*, step 4, cols. 693–96; trans. Luibheid and Russell, pp. 100–101.

114 Thus an elder advises a younger man to find " 'the harshest and strictest trainer in the Lord . . . and persevering daily imbibe insult and scorn. . . .' " His imperfections were to be held at naught: " 'Even if you see him fornicating, do not go away from him' " (John Climacus, *Scala paradisi*, step 4, cols. 723–24; trans. Luibheid and Russell, p. 117).

115 John Climacus, *Scala paradisi*, step 4, cols. 725–26; trans. Luibheid and Russell, p. 118.

116 John Climacus, *Scala paradisi*, step 4, cols. 727–28; trans. Luibheid and Russell, p. 119; Cf. cols. 691–92, 709–10; trans. Luibheid and Russell, pp. 99, 109 where the superior is again compared with God.

117 Isidore of Seville, *Sententiae* 3.1.4, *PL* 83, col. 653; this quotation is from the chapter entitled "On the Scourges of God" ("De flagellis Dei").

118 Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 121.

119 Huyskens, *Der sog. Libellus*, p. 46.

120 See Isentrud's testimony, Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, pp. 121–22.

121 See Huyskens's introduction to ibid., p. 84.

122 In his letter to Gregory, he merely says that he had rarely met a more contemplative woman, that various people had seen her face shining marvelously, and that she experienced many raptures (Huyskens, *Quellenstudien*, p. 159). The handmaidens are a little more forthcoming, although Elisabeth's humility made her extremely reticent (ibid., pp. 122–23). Cf. the expanded version (Huyskens, *Der sog. Libellus*, p. 37). The latter also recounts how Elisabeth, suspended in contemplation, might have been set on fire by a spark had not one of the maids returned (ibid., pp. 72–73). The same story is told verbatim by Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale* 30.136, in *Speculum quadruplex*, 4:1279.

123 John of Dambach, *Liber de consolacione humane vite vel De consolacione theologiae*, tract 3, Bodleian MS. 881, fol. 142r.

124 Richer, *Gesta* 4.35, *MGH SS*, 25:319, 321. Over time, one actually finds the occasional panegyric on Conrad, as in Jacobus Montanus Spirensis's sermon

of 1511. See Kaltner, *Konrad,* p. 169 n. 1; May, “Zur Geschichte Konrads,” p. 88.

PART 2

Inquisitions and Proof

Chapter Four

Sanctity, Heresy, and Inquisition

> Then the bishop, calling his vicar, immediately condemned [the old woman] as a heretic by the power of Christ. The vicar, moreover, had her carried thus to the fire with the bed in which she lay, . . . and immediately
>
> burned. . . . But the bishop and the friars and their companions, when this was done, went to the refectory
>
> and they ate what things were prepared with joy, giving
>
> thanks to God and blessed Dominic. The Lord performed
>
> these things on the first solemnity of the blessed Dominic, to the glory and praise of his name and of his
>
> servant, the blessed Dominic, and the exaltation of the
>
> faith and the suppression of heretics and their belief.
>
> (William Pelhisson, *Chronicon* ann. 1234)[1]

THE VERY FIRST FEAST DAY of Saint Dominic (d. 1221), founder of the order of inquisitors of heresy par excellence, was celebrated by the quasi-miraculous discovery and immolation of an old Cathar granny on her deathbed. The holy women discussed thus far represent some of the more nuanced ways in which sanctity was used to combat heresy. In this inquisitorial celebration of Saint Dominic's feast day, however, the struggle is naked and undisguised. Whether their power is operating overtly or more subtly, however, saints can perform to their full potential as arms of orthodoxy only when the boundaries between orthodoxy and heterodoxy have been decisively maintained. Yet saints and heretics would gradually lose some of this didactic tension and become uncomfortably proximate over the course of the High and later Middle Ages. The gradual collapse of these polarities was in many ways due, directly or indirectly, to the dependence on the inquisitional process as a primary means of classification.

The introduction of the inquisitional procedure was, as we have seen, the work of the thirteenth century. Prior to this, the demarcation of heretics and saints occurred at a local level. An individual's reputation would identify himor her as a paragon of sanctity or a threat to orthodoxy. If a person was reputed by the vox populi to have led a holy life and continued to work miracles after death, canonization simply required the translation of the individual's remains by the bishop.[2] In this earlier period, the community had likewise played a fundamental role in the persecution of heresy. On the basis of the scattered accounts that remain, individuals suspected

of heresy were denounced to the bishop, who would, in turn, often personally investigate the charges. Although members of the clergy were not permitted to shed blood and could thus not invoke the death penalty, individuals deemed guilty and unrepentant often fell victim to mob violence. The sources tend to suggest that this violence was spontaneous and the bishop powerless to defend heretics from the outraged populace. But the bishop's incapacity in such situations could also be read as tacit consent.[3]

A certain consensus between clergy and laity was thus the key to the determination of sanctity and heresy up until the end of the twelfth century. Although the community would continue to play a substantial part in the identification of these two states, this role was undoubtedly curtailed with the centralization of the canonization of saints and the prosecution of heretics through the papacy, which were roughly concurrent developments. At Lateran IV, Innocent III had attempted to stem the burgeoning cult of relics, insisting that public veneration be contingent on papal authorization. Similarly, the first papal canonizations were performed during his pontificate.[4] As noted in chapter 1, it was also Lateran IV that both assumed an intransigent position on heresy, compelling secular and religious authorities to take action, and further introduced the inquisitional procedure for the prosecution of criminous clerics.[5] The application of this same procedure to distinguish heretics and saints alike would soon follow. Innocent III was also the first to require that canonizations comply with an inquisitional format, while further refinements occurred under Gregory IX.[6] We have already seen the pivotal role played by his penitentiary, Raymond of PeÑafort, in the promotion of the *inquisitio* with respect to both sanctity and heresy. Thus in 1232 he sent Conrad of Marburg an interrogatory for witnesses attesting to the miracles of Elisabeth of Hungary. Raymond's 1235 "consultation" with the bishop of Tarragona, moreover, serves as a kind of prototype for the interrogations proposed in manuals developed for the inquisitors of heresy.[7]

Over the course of the thirteenth century, the growing emphasis on inquisitional procedure corresponded to a gradual decline in the fortunes of holy women. Their spirituality, always suspect to some minds, was no longer so clearly perceived as a vehicle for affirming orthodoxy; meanwhile, the criteria for proving some of their dramatic spiritual claims were becoming more stringent. The example of Elisabeth of Hungary already offers a compelling instance of howthe confessional relationship could be overshadowed by the priest's dual role of confessor and inquisitor. This chapter examines howthe very enlistment of the inquisition for both sanctity and heresy intensifies any implicit tendency for the two extremes to dissolve into one

another—a dangerous trend that could permit the dramatis personae of the respective dramas to end up in the wrong play. What follows is a summary of inquisitional procedure as applied first to heresy and then to sanctity, ultimately with a view to illuminating how parallels in procedure led to the other more disturbing synchronicities.

HERESY AND SANCTITY: TWO DIRECTIONS, ONE ROAD

The procedure employed by the inquisitors of heresy was basically in place by the mid–thirteenth century.[8] An inquisitor (usually a Dominican, but sometimes a Franciscan "to temper rigor with sweetness," as one chronicler put it)[9] would arrive in a given place and call the people together for a "general sermon," first authorizing his task through letters from the pope and the archbishop. If this was the first time the area was associated with heresy, a period of grace was announced during which individuals who came forward voluntarily to attest to their own or their neighbors' guilt would be pardoned and spared death, imprisonment, exile, or confiscation of goods. Such "volunteers" might even evade public penance if they were not widely known as heretics or heretical sympathizers. But the period of grace was reserved only for areas in which heresy was widespread. Moreover, only first-time offenders could avail themselves of its benefits.[10]

Although their activities were certainly authorized and sometimes coordinated by the papacy, the inquisitors traveled with only a skeleton entourage, thus requiring the cooperation of various local authorities. First and foremost among these was the bishop. Indeed, the inquisitors were, in theory, not permitted to go forward without episcopal cooperation since the presence of the bishop or his official was necessary to legitimize the various stages of the proceedings. Moreover, episcopal concurrence in the death sentence, after much back-and-forth, was finally upheld as the rule in 1317.11 The bishop was also supposed to foot the bill for the inquisition's expenses. But Gui Foucois (the future Clement IV, d. 1268) was sufficiently realistic about the difficulties in making the bishops pay up, describing them as having "grasping hands and constipated purses" (*tenaces sunt manus, et marsupia constipata*). His contingency plan was to raise the requisite funds by assigning money payments as penance.[12] We can see this policy at work in the trial of the Guglielmites, discussed below, in which the inquisitors consistently set high bail at the outset and assigned fines as penance.[13] Two impartial men, unaffiliated with the inquisition but generally from the Dominican order, were recruited to be present at the actual interrogation of the defendant and witnesses

alike. Sworn to silence, these observers of the proceedings were the only exception to the complete secrecy of the tribunal. They were required to sign along with the notary testifying to the regularity of the process.[14] Finally, the inquisitors must also assemble "some other persons, provident, and honest, and learned in the law," as representatives of the community (these, in practice, tended to be clerics) to reviewthe entire procedure and give counsel with respect to the final sentencing.[15]

The secular authorities were responsible for the more penal aspects of the prosecution: the apprehension, torture, imprisonment, execution, forfeiture of property, or the destruction of the homes of heretics and their sympathizers. The inquisitors were further empowered to make secular rulers "do justice," even in the event that the individuals in question were excommunicated.[16] A notary was recruited to render the proceedings in a legal form and to attest to every document. Inquisitors could also press into service members of religious orders, particularly the mendicant orders, to act as scribes responsible for molding the deponent's testimony, though this task could also be performed by appropriate laymen when necessary. Almost all of the depositions required translation into Latin and the recasting of a first-person dialogue into a third-person narrative that, very often, suppressed the question that had prompted a particular answer. These literate conscripts would also be required to write the citations of witnesses, the depositions resulting from the cross-examinations, and the sentences. From the later thirteenth century on, most of the inquisitors' manuals were equipped with diverse sets of formulas for producing the appropriate documents. According to Bernard Gui, the scribes might also be obliged to attend enforced study sessions in order to familiarize themselves with the necessary forms.[17]

The period of grace was not to exceed thirty days. Once this time had elapsed, parishioners suspected of heresy were summoned and questioned according to the interrogatories developed for this purpose. The inquisition operated ex officio on the basis of rumor or denunciation.[18] Thus in the event that heresy was believed to be rife in an area, the inquisitors might summon all parishioners of legal age (twelve for women, fourteen for men), or even younger if the child in question was a known offender. Occasionally, specific individuals could be summoned as a result of a direct *accusatio* by another, although this older form was becoming increasingly rare.[19] Interrogation occurred in private, while those examined were warned to keep their testimonies secret.[20] Most of the later manuals contain descriptions of the various heresies afoot in the High and later Middle Ages, proffering specific articles upon which suspected members of

different sects should be quizzed, and volunteering ingenious strategies of entrapment. As with other trials, legal defense was, theoretically, permitted to defendants, although in practice it was discouraged and rarely obtained. The prosecution of heresy, however, differed from other legal proceedings insofar as the names of witnesses were suppressed, a procedure sharply counter to Lateran IV's directives on other kinds of inquests.[21] Those accused were nevertheless given the opportunity to list their mortal enemies. (The latter were still permitted to testify, but their testimony was to be scrutinized more critically.)

With the issue of Clement IV's bull *Ad extirpanda*, inquisitors were permitted to apply torture in order to extort a confession.[22] They were exculpated from the implications of this and other routine inquisitorial practices by a papal indulgence, which pardoned any sin they might incur in the pursuit of their duties. Inquisitors could also absolve each other, their confreres, and their familiars (individuals the like of Conrad of Mar-burg's motley informers and go-betweens) from any sins they might have incurred.[23] Although two witnesses were required to indict an individual, torture could be applied on the basis of "partial proof"—suspicion cast by the testimony of a single witness.[24] It could be applied only once—that is, unless newproofs appeared against the individual. But even such strictures were foiled by the fact that, instead of reapplication, the inquisitors discovered the solution of continuous torture, which was permitted to last three days. That the inquisitor might stand in need of any special indulgence for which he would be eligible is suggested by Nicolas Eymeric, whose manual gives one of the most complete accounts of torture, including dark hints about the "many licit tricks [*cautelas*] the judges can apply in words and deeds, so that the truth can be had—which experience and practice and the different kinds of business will teach better than the art or doctrine of anyone." The notary is required to give a detailed account of the proceedings, including howthe individual was questioned, although these documents rarely seem to survive.[25] Later the defendant, removed from the instruments of torture, is expected to affirm his or her testimony, which should ideally eventuate in a confession. If he or she refuses to confess, torture may be reapplied.[26] According to some legal opinions, a witness can also be tortured—especially when his or her testimony indicts a member of the clergy.[27] Eymeric permits the torture of a cleric only if his crime is infamous.[28]

All confessions, whether extracted through torture or not, were duly recorded and read back in the vernacular so the defendant had the opportunity to make corrections—a process that was supposed to occur in the presence of two members of the clergy.[29] But such

transcripts were far from verbatim accounts. Bernard Gui (d. 1331), for example, recommends that not everything in a defendant's deposition be written down, except in summary. Likewise, the anonymous *Concerning the Office of the Inquisition* permits the inquisitor to add material in the event that the defendant's answer was confused or incomplete and there is no occasion for reexamination.[30] With regard to heretical doctrines, university and conciliar tribunals were inclined to develop lists of condemned articles extracted from proscribed works that a given author, if still living, was required to renounce. Occasionally, the same procedure was undertaken on behalf of less erudite heretics, although this is rather rare.[31]

At the conclusion of their testimony, defendants were required to abjure heresy. Those found innocent of any taint of heresy were released, while the guilty were returned to prison to await sentencing.With the interrogations complete, the inquisitor deliberated with the bishop and the assembly of the learned in order to arrive at appropriate sentences. The sentencing, also referred to as the "general sermon" as at the opening of the inquisition, was dramatically staged in a public forum.[32]

The presumed urgency of the prosecution of heresy justified the use of summary justice. The efforts of Clement V (d. 1314) to expedite trials were typical: "We order that cases proceed without the noise and shape of a trial. . . . [The judge] should curtail the causes of delay, the litigation, as much as he is able. He should make [the process] very brief by repelling exceptions, appeals, and vain delays; by restraining the contentions and altercations of the parties, of advocates and procurators, and the superfluous throng of witnesses." This decree, and others like it, were frequently cited with approval by the authors of the various inquisitional manuals.[33] One of the more egregious irregularities fostered by this policy was the dual role of the inquisitor, who functioned as both prosecutor and chief justice—a conflation that was extremely prejudicial to the defendants.

In contrast with the summary justice that characterized heretical trials, the process of canonization was exquisitely slow, justifying the claim of canon lawyer Hostiensis (d. 1261) that it differed from other ecclesiastical legal cases only in its intrinsic eminence and degree of rigor.[34] But the unhurried, processual nature of canonization corresponded to a more subtle distinction between the two procedures: the degree of clerical confidence. Canonists and theologians were not nearly so sanguine about their abilities to identify a saint as they were about their powers to detect a heretic. Goffred of Trani, writing between 1241 and 1243, was one of the more forthcoming scholars in his description of the requirements for canonized sanctity, yet his criteria were exceedingly vague: much

hardship (*pro laboris*), chaste ways, and strenuous acts.[35] The only two canons in the *Decretals* that concern the veneration of saints are further indicative: the first is from a letter of Alexander III (d. 1181) regarding a deluded congregation that "through diabolical fraud" was venerating a dead drunkard as a saint; the second is Lateran IV's denunciation of the traffic in relics, many of which were deemed fakes.[36]

The papacy's intrinsic pessimism not only cast suspicion on efforts to create newsaints; it may even help to explain ecclesiastical reticence in articulating howto conduct a canonization. Of course, questions of exigency enter into it: compared to its heretical counterpart, canonization was an extremely rare procedure, even as the number of saints presumably pales in comparison to the number of heretics. Yet even the deliberately prescriptive texts are permeated with defeatism. In Hostiensis's commentary on the *Decretals*, for example, one of the fullest accounts of the procedure for canonization for the High and later Middle Ages, ecclesiastical reluctance is adumbrated. Thus he opens with warnings that evil men and sinners are sometimes able to perform miracles; certain miraculous effects can be achieved through human artifice; and there is always the danger that the church will unwittingly mislead the faithful.[37] Indeed, at the very moment of the public and solemn canonization, the pope is required to acknowledge directly the possibility of failure, asking the people to pray "that God does not permit him to err in this business."[38] Both Innocent IV (d. 1254) and Hostiensis were prepared for such a contingency, arguing that the prayers of the faithful would still be credited for their good intentions. The same principle permits people to venerate whomever they like in private, because God will attend to the integrity of their faith.[39] Nevertheless, the prospect of an error in canonization still had the power to make theologians of the caliber of Aquinas flinch.[40] Whatever the reasons behind this refusal to articulate adequately formal expectations for sanctity and saint making, it functioned as a tacit, though perhaps unconscious, strategy for inhibiting a growing plethora of saints—a multiplication through which, as Hostiensis argues in a much cited phrase, "charity and devotion growcold." [41]

The ensuing summary of procedure basically follows the contours of Hostiensis's directives, as supplemented by the contemporary prescriptive account of Cardinal James Gaetani (d. 1343). The latter also provides essential testimony as an eyewitness. He was present for John XXII's canonization of Thomas of Cantilupe (d. 1282) and actually assisted at Clement V's canonization of Peter of Morrone (d. 1296, better known as Pope Celestine V). He gives an exceptionally detailed account of the proceedings surrounding the latter event.

There is also a brief account of the canonization of Bridget of Sweden (d. 1373) by a clerical observer. The process necessarily began at a local level. A person with a reputation for sanctity dies. The sponsors of the cult appeal to Rome, not once but, according to Hostiensis, "many times pressingly without desisting or waning."[42] Once alerted, the pope must then wait, attending to the saint's reputation and ensuring that the miracles do not cease. Hostiensis reports that it was widely believed that if the miracles were illusory, they would not continue beyond forty days.[43] After consultation with the cardinals, if the pope is satisfied that there is a possible case, he appoints several individuals, among whom there is usually a bishop or two, or other individuals who have the reputation for being "honest, discreet, and incorruptible." These men, recruited from the candidate's homeland or nearby, will make inquiries into the case and then report back to the pope.[44] The pope, in turn, after again consulting with his cardinals, will determine whether or not an investigation is warranted. If he chooses to proceed, he will issue a bull instructing an appointed group of investigators (who are usually the same individuals involved in the preliminary inquiry) to initiate an inquest into the life and miracles of the putative saint.

These lengthy preliminaries essentially correspond to the circumstances that would attract the inquisitor of heretical depravity to a given area. The saintly counterpart to the heretical inquest likewise begins with rumor and public declaration. This is especially apparent in Gaetani's choice of wording when he describes how the ex officio action is initiated "when the reputation [*fama*] of some holy person is heard by our pope and the business announced [*negotio denunciato*] by some honest and authentic persons to our same lord pope."[45] But the pope's extreme caution, evident in the preliminary inquest undertaken to assess the need for the real inquest, demonstrates the interaction between *fama* and *inquisitio* in slow motion.

Of course, in exceptional cases this preliminary investigation was omitted, bringing the procedure even more closely in line with heretical trials. From Gaetani's account, this would seem to have been the case in the canonization of Peter of Morrone. Upon the petition of Philip the Fair (d. 1314), Clement V immediately commissioned the archbishop of Naples and the bishop of Valencia to begin the inquiry proper.[46] Yet excessive haste could mean courting humiliation. We have seen that various popes had misstepped in launching inquests for martyred inquisitors, only to be foiled by the total absence of local enthusiasm for such a cult. But whether the preliminary investigation was undertaken or dispensed with, these proceedings led to the same kind of appointments: as with the inquisitors into heretical depravity,

inquisitors into sanctity are empowered as an arm of the papacy. The chief difference is that, in contrast to the often permanent appointments of inquisitors for heresy, the inquisitors for sanctity occupy only temporary posts.

The actual inquiry conducted at the local level is below the purviewof Hostiensis or the other prescriptive accounts of a canonization proper. But, as with heretical trials, this stage of the canonization relied on a combination of external and local talent. The combination of the two is apparent in the associations of the inquisitors themselves: on the one hand, they had an external function as papal commissioners; on the other hand, they simultaneously represented the local episcopal authority, which, if not actually corresponding to the precise diocese, was at least from the region where the holy person had resided. A formal representative (postulator or, later, procurator) was appointed by the real sponsors of the cult to oversee the case, including the final deliberations in Rome. His position could be regarded as the legal counsel to the dead holy person and his or her sponsors—counsel that the defendant in the heretical trial was theoretically allowed but usually denied. (And it should be remembered that the defendant in a heretical trial could be either living or dead. If the latter, counsel might still be retained by the family, since a heretical ancestor would imperil the property of his or her descendants.) The counsel's implicitly litigious role becomes ever more apparent over the course of the thirteenth century as this position was increasingly filled by a lawyer or at least someone with legal training, a change indicated in the shift in designation from postulator to procurator.[47] The procurator would ask the individuals most intimate with the candidate to summarize his or her life and miracles. This summary would, in turn, be transformed into a set of rubrics or articles that would form the basis for the *articuli interrogatorii*, the guidelines for investigation.[48] Occasionally, the papacy would provide its commissioners with the actual articles to which the witnesses were expected to testify,[49] but generally, these were prepared under the direction of the procurator. (By comparison, these articles represent something of a cross between the various questions posed in an inquisitional manual and the condemned articles extracted from an individual's work that the accused is supposed to abjure.)

At this stage, someone, frequently the confessor to the deceased holy person, would preach a sermon concerning the merits of the deceased, inviting individuals to come forward to testify—a process that is comparable to the inquisitor's initial general sermon and invitation either to confess or to testify during the period of grace. The procurator was generally responsible for assembling the witnesses in

preparation for the arrival of the papally appointed inquisitors, who would, in turn, interrogate these witnesses on their knowledge of the candidate's sanctity, the miracles performed during his or her lifetime, and (better still) those performed after death. It was not uncommon to find the various sponsors of a given individual's cult playing multiple roles. John of Marienwerder, confessor to Dorothea of Montau, was particularly handson.[50] Not only did he write her various vitae, but it was John who preached the sermon at Dorothea's funeral celebrating her virtues.[51] John also managed to complete his works and disseminate them widely before the majority of the witnesses had testified at the inquest concerning the grounds for her canonization, as is evident from the ubiquitous references to the Dorothean corpus throughout the entire proceedings. He additionally was procurator for Dorothea's cult, and hence responsible for the articles of interrogation.[52] At Dorothea's tomb in the cathedral of Marienwerder, a scribe was set up to record and publicize daily the miracles that were performed.[53] As a member of the cathedral chapter of Marienwerder who knew the various scribes, John was in an excellent position to oversee the burgeoning cult and to keep abreast of the various beneficiaries of the miracles, perhaps also engaging in some benign indoctrination on the saint's life and virtues.[54] John was also seemingly of the persuasion that the seal of confession could be waived for the excellent motive of revealing the sanctity of a deceased penitent—an opinion that would be increasingly frowned upon by later authorities and would ultimately rule out the testimony of the confessor in processes of canonization altogether. Undeterred by such scruples, John even circulated some of Dorothea's exemplary confessions as a freestanding text.[55]

In the early thirteenth century, the witnesses would merely testify to the various articles pertaining to the prospective saint's life and miracles. But from the time of Gregory IX, witnesses were cross-examined according to the *forma interrogatorii* developed for Saint Elisabeth of Hungary's process, bringing the examination of witnesses more closely in line with heretical trials.[56] Compared with the skeleton team with which inquisitors into heretical depravity traveled, their sanctification-minded counterparts were usually accompanied by a substantial retinue, in keeping with their more exalted rank. But both groups were composed primarily of members of the mendicant orders, and both also recruited personnel on a local level. In cases of canonization, members of the inquisitors' retinue or local scribes would assist in translating and recasting witnesses' testimonies in a fashion similar to the procedure discussed above. Notaries, who were introduced into the process from around 1220, would then put these testimonies into the requisite public form and legally attest to them.[57]

A heretical trial would, at this stage, proceed from a speedy judgment to sentencing, not only driven by the logic implicit in summary justice but further impelled by what can only be described as an institutional paranoia over howinquisitorial hesitation or indecision might be perceived. For instance, Bernard Gui was sensitive to the potential dangers if the proceedings "are abandoned, as it were, in confusion, and they [the laity] are to some extent weakened in their faith by observing that learned men are thus mocked by lowand uncouth persons."[58] The assessors in a process of canonization, however, apparently experienced no such qualms. Delay was normal and, perhaps, even desirable since it was so concrete a demonstration of the degree of weighty deliberation involved. Aspects of this delay were structural. In cases of canonization, the roles of inquisitor and judge were, according to correct legal form, more clearly separated than was the practice with inquests into heresy. With the centralization of canonization through the papacy, judgment and final sentencing belonged to the papal curia. Thus once the inquest was complete, the dossier—comprising an account of the entire process, a vita, the articles supporting contentions of sanctity, and the testimony of witnesses—was copied by the notary, sealed by the inquisitors, and sent to the pope.

The papal curia's deliberation and final pronouncement on sanctity occurred in slowmotion. Not only could this portion of the process take years, but frequently, in response to curial queries, the dossier might be sent back for supplemental material or the inquest abandoned altogether. Yet despite these immense differences in pacing from heretical trials, certain similarities still pertain in the circumstances surrounding judgment in each forum. Both the inquisitor into heresy and the pope in his determination of sanctity are supposedly reliant on counsel: the bishop and the assembly of the learned in heretical trials, the College of Cardinals in a process of canonization. Thus, as outlined in Gaetani's directives, the pope designates certain members of the curia to examine the entire dossier carefully—summarizing it, and dividing it into sections with rubrics. He then assigns a different set of cardinals (a priest, a deacon, and a bishop, according to Gaetani) to examine the rubrics, in conjunction with the entire process. A full report is made in consistory by this second set of cardinals; it describes the general contours of the process but leaves aside the depositions of witnesses on the life and miracles of the candidate. (It is presumably at this time that the rubrics are read out, though Gaetani does not say this explicitly.) At a final secret consistory, the depositions of the witnesses attesting to the life and miracles of the saint are read aloud, beginning with the life, while the pope and the cardinals discuss whether or not the individual witnesses

make their case for every given contention or miracle. One of the cardinals acts as secretary, recording each cardinal's vote on the different items.[59] The pope then pronounces on whether or not canonization is warranted.

A number of documents still remain demonstrating the rigor and complexity of the proceedings leading up to the final secret consistory. Sometime between 1288 and 1297, for example, Cardinal Peter of Colonna was commissioned to write an assessment of the validity of the second miracle attributed to Saint Louis IX concerning whether a certain Amelot of Chaumont had, in fact, been healed of her crippling infirmity. Carefully articulating the pros and cons, the exercise is set up like a scholastic disputation. 60 Similarly, an unknown member of the curia produced a report on the life and, particularly, the miracles of Saint Thomas of Cantilupe. Bypassing the miracles that were deemed proven, the anonymous cardinal lingered over the ones that raised doubts—assaying legitimization through biblical or theological precedents, or, failing that, making efforts at establishing empirical evidence through rudimentary medical knowledge and the like.[61]

Of particular interest is the verbal process of the final secret consistory of 1306 for Peter of Morrone, which can be read against Gaetani's more general report of the proceedings.[62] In a slight departure from the protocol outlined in Gaetani, both the rubrics and testimonies to miracles were read aloud in consistory on the same occasion at an earlier stage in the proceedings. Clement V apparently took this opportunity to attest with his own hand to the miracles that seemed to be fully proven. At this point, the pope appointed "six or eight prelates of great knowledge and dignity to examine that inquisition carefully, not touching those things that your sanctity [i.e., the pope] decided or signed with the counsel of the brothers." 63 In preparation for the final secret consistory "and so that your [i.e.the pope's] brethren can deliberate more securely, you had many of the attestations of the miracles put into writing at length, word for word."[64]

The verbal process begins by listing possible procedural doubts raised by two of the cardinals: should the inquest be redone since Peter's fame had not been investigated sufficiently? The answer is no, because his fame was already known throughout the world. Should the initial inquest be redone since much of it was the work of only one person? (And in fact Gaetani tells us that the bishop of Valencia died in the course of the inquest, and the archbishop of Naples had to complete it alone.) The answer is still no; not only was the remaining inquisitor commissioned to act, but much more arduous inquisitions have been undertaken by only one person.[65] Procedurally, should they not begin by examining the sanctity of Peter's life rather than his

miracles? Here again the answer is no, because the miracles after his death will attest to his sanctity.[66]

Subsequent to these preliminaries, the miracles are grouped according to when they were performed: before Peter became pope, during his papacy, after his abdication, or after his death. A rubric summarizing each miracle is followed by a brief statement of whether or not an individual cardinal was satisfied with the proof in question. The vote of each cardinal on a given miracle is scrupulously recorded. If a substantial majority was convinced by the evidence and agreed that the incident was indeed a miracle, it received papal approval through a terse formula: "The Lord [pope] defines that it is a miracle and is sufficiently proven," or words to that effect. In instances where a majority, or even a substantial number, of the cardinals were skeptical, the papal imprimatur was withheld and the miracle ultimately does not appear in the bull of canonization.[67] Gaetani's recollection of these determinations concludes with a reiteration of how miracles are the surest way of reflecting holiness of life: "Finally after careful effort it was found by your sanctity and your brothers that some miracles were performed through his merits before the papacy of that Brother Peter, and some in the papacy, and some after its renunciation and before death, and some in death, and some after death, and the good and holy life of Brother Peter was proved."[68]

The circumstances surrounding the first miracle examined in the secret consistory are especially illuminating. In this instance alone, the papal imprimatur ("Dominus definivit istud miraculum esse, et esse probatum sufficienter") is affixed in advance of the cardinals' vote—a deviation that the editor ascribes to undue haste on the scribe's part.[69] But this reversal may identify the miracle as one of the fewthat had already received papal approval, which (according to Gaetani's assurances) the cardinals would not presume to gainsay. If this was the case, the pope seems to have been prepared to forfeit a modicum of papal dignity for the security of curial support, and thus subjected this miracle to the rigors of the cardinals' examination. It did not stand the test. Eleven of the cardinals agreed that the episode in question was a miracle. A twelfth equivocated, saying that he had not seen the depositions in their entirety that attested to the miracle but wished to see them. A thirteenth said that it was a miracle, but added "as according to human judgment"—clearly wishing to register the possible fallibility of his own. But three of the cardinals did not believe the miracle sufficiently proven, at least for purposes of canonization. Two more said it was neither a miracle nor proven (although one of these added that he did not doubt that the episode occurred in fact, but it was not sufficiently established for purposes of canonization—a comment that seems gratuituous considering he did

not think the event qualified as a miracle in the first place). Thus the eleven affirmations that this was a true miracle (twelve, counting the pope's) were countered by a full seven expressions of differing degrees of doubt. These odds were simply not good enough. The fact that this particular miracle was not included in the bull of canonization, despite a possible papal imprimatur, emphasizes the degree of papal dependency on the counsel of the cardinals.

Thus, in their capacity as counsel to the pope, the College of Cardinals extended the interrogatory stage of the inquisition, subjecting the dossier (but ultimately the saint and witnesses to his or her sanctity alike) to its most vigorous cross-examination yet. In the fifteenth century, moreover, the adversarial nature of this task would be formally recognized in the creation of the office of *procurator fidei* —a position that would eventually come to be known as the "devil's advocate." The implicit contours of a courtroom trial achieve even clearer definition as canonizations are transformed into a struggle between the original *procurator*, who acted on behalf of his holy "defendant," and the prosecuting *procurator fidei*.[70]

The curia's central role in determining the final judgment suggests a major difference between the theory and practice of our two kinds of inquisition. For, in theory, the inquisitor of heresy is not autonomous and is supposed to arrive at a judgment, informed by the assembly of the learned, in conjunction with the bishop. In cases of canonization, however, despite repeated recommendations for counsel, the final decision resides solely with the pope—a point dwelt on lovingly by experts like Hostiensis.[71] Indeed, for the canonization of Peter of Morrone, Gaetani reports that at several crucial junctures when the cardinals were required to speak on the saint's merits in public, they invariably concluded with the supplication for the pope to canonize. The pope would respond by saying, "You well knowth at canonization pertains to us alone."[72] Yet, in practice, the positions of inquisitorial dependency in cases of heresy versus papal autonomy in cases of canonization were often just the reverse.73With the Guglielmite sect, the inquisitors conducted the interrogations entirely on their own, dispensing altogether with even a show of episcopal collaboration. In the Bolognese inquisition occurring between 1296 and 1301, for which the consultations with the counsel of the learned are extant, their contribution usually provided credible support for the inquisitors' decisions.[74] Hence inquisitors were frequently rebuked for acting autonomously, dismissing the requisite auxilliary counsel as nugatory. Meanwhile, the pope voluntarily sacrificed his own will to curial discretion.

Hitherto, the investigative part of the procedure for canonization has been a series of inquisitions within inquisitions, resembling

nothing so much as an ornamental egg whose laquered shell opens to reveal a smaller egg, and so forth. The same principle is at work with the final liturgical stage of the process, only now in reverse, as the movement proceeds from smaller to progressively larger replicas. This is one way, at least, of describing the dress rehearsals for dress rehearsals that eventually culminate in the canonization proper. Thus if the saint has been properly acquitted throughout the various inquests, the larger clerical community of archbishops, bishops, and important prelates are called together and informally told of the upcoming canonization. A second (but by no means secondary) motive is to establish the protocol for the dress rehearsal that precedes the public consistory, at which time the clergy will, in turn, be briefed on the protocol for the public consistory itself. It is only at this latter event that the greater clergy are *formally* made aware of the business afoot. The procurator will usually make his case before the pope at this time. Many of the cardinals will preach on the merits of the prospective saint and then join in the procurator's supplications. After the pope has indicated his willingness to act, various cardinals are commissioned to prepare appropriate prayers and litanies.[75]

The canonization proper will, in turn, adumbrate the preparations and the ritual already described for the public consistory. The news is eventually disseminated among the lesser clergy and the laity, and the preordained day for the canonization (assigned at least a month ahead of time) arrives. The appointed church is adorned with carpets and candles. The pope, arriving in the morning and dressed in his red mantle that was adorned with exquisite embroidery from England (the famed *opus anglicanum*) and a miter of burnished gold and pearls, enters in procession with the clerics attached to that particular church, assisted by two cardinal deacons. He goes to the altar and prays, and then seats himself in a prominent chair in front of the altar. Subsequent to this, the cardinals enter, dressed in their albs, do their accustomed reverence to the pope, and seat themselves facing him according to rank, as was the custom in consistory. The other prelates are seated behind the cardinals, with the laity behind them.[76] The pope then removes his miter and proceeds to render an account of the process and the various proofs, requesting that the people pray for him "that God not permit him to err in this business." After a series of prayers, the pope formally declares that the individual is made a saint by the universal church (Gaetani provides a set formula for the actual declaration of canonization), to be inscribed in the catalog of saints, and worshiped by all on his or her feast day. A solemn office is then read. Those who visit the saint's tomb on the feast day will receive an indulgence of a year and forty days; those who approach during the octave of the feast, forty days. Subsequent to this declaration, many of

the cardinals will, in turn, preach the merits of the saint. Those in attendance are granted an indulgence of seven years and as many Lenten fasts. Finally, solemn mass is celebrated in the newsaint's honor, concluding with another set of indulgences. The ceremony is a grand one. Gaetani claims that there were 150 large torches (*torticia*) and either 450 or 500 smaller ones for Peter of Morrone's canonization.[77] The immense number of candles was also emphasized in the anonymous account of Bridget's canonization: candles encrusted in gold, worked with roses and assorted flowers painted different colors, little candles all painted green with two doves and two turtledoves. The pope was angry (*fuit turbatus*) when the canons of the cathedral processed without the candles they were supposed to be carrying, and, still sulking, dined alone in his room that night with only his immediate household for company.[78]

Although infinitely more elaborate, the formal ritual of canonization is nonetheless possessed of an unmistakable correspondence to the general sermon where the final sentencing of heretics occurs. According to the directives of Bernard Gui, the laity are similarly summoned to an appointed place (usually a church) for the following morning in order to hear the sentences. The inquisitor would be flanked by his counselors, paralleling the manner in which the cardinals clustered around the pope. Even as the pope summarized the process, the inquisitor also gives a quick summary of the proceedings, concluding with the conferral of indulgences (usually forty days) upon those in attendance. Next, penitential crosses are bestowed on individuals guilty of relatively minor infractions.[79] Only then are the penitents led from prison. Each penitent is asked to affirm his or her testimony, which is read in the vernacular—a crude equivalent of the pope's reciting proofs of sanctity before the sentence of canonization is passed. Then the faults of individuals are recited in the vernacular, hierarchically in order of gravity: those who are assigned simple penance; those who are to be imprisoned; those who, bearing false witness, will do penance and be imprisoned; priests and clerics who are degraded and imprisoned; those who would have been degraded and imprisoned if they were alive; the impenitent dead who were to be exhumed; fugitives who were condemned of heresy; those relapsed into heresy who finally abjured but must nevertheless be relinquished to the secular arm; those who abjured heresy once but have subsequently relapsed or those who have never converted—first laypersons, then clerics; then, adamant heretics or those who never confessed but were convicted by the weighty testimony of others. Sentences of excommunication are then passed against fugitives or individuals whose cases are still in progress. Finally, the houses belonging to heretics and therefore consigned to demolition are

announced. Then follow the sentences—first read in Latin, then in the vernacular, in a similar order to the one outlined above.[80]

Thus instead of the elevation of a single holy person, confirmed in God's presence in heaven, we have a multitiered assembly of sinners destined for different degrees of punishment. The exaltation of the saint's merits corresponds to the systematic ranking of penitents, according to their demerits. Moreover, the two rituals have parallel aftermaths: the remains of the saint will be exhumed and solemnly translated by the bishop, usually in the holy person's place of demise or native land; the remains of the heretic will be exhumed and burned. The translation of a saint was invested with considerable drama. While Saint Elisabeth of Hungary was officially canonized in Perugia by Gregory IX, the translation occurred in Marburg, where a monastery had already been founded over her body. Frederick II (d. 1250), having only just quelled a rebellion, flew to the tomb of his more worthy kinswoman so he, dressed in penitential gray, could assist in raising Elisabeth's holy remains. In anticipation of his arrival, the body was removed from the ground three days earlier and discovered incorrupt. The head was temporarily separated from the body so the flesh and hair could be removed from the skull ("lest the sight strike horror in the onlookers," Caesarius of Heisterbach tells us —a comment somewhat at odds with the alleged miraculous state of preservation). Before the head was restored, Frederick adorned it with a crown of precious stones.[81] The body was then placed in a lead casket and sealed with the seals of bishops and other prelates, with a number of religious as witnesses. Some days after the translation, the sarcophagus was opened for the distribution of relics, and they were delighted to find a sweet-smelling oil that emanated from the bones with the power to work miracles.[82]

The translation of heretics seems like a macabre parody of this ritual. William Pelhisson's chronicle is punctuated by the lurid procession through the town of exhumed bodies of heretics destined for burning.[83] And just as a saintly relative was a boon beyond compare, even to a celebrated skeptic such as Frederick, so the posthumous exhumation of a relative could destroy a family's reputation, rob its members of their property, and elicit suspicions of heresy. People naturally struggled to spare their relatives (and themselves) this ignominy.

CHANGING PLACES

> I saw certain priests, even great men, in solemnities with relics that they offered people to recognize and to proffer kisses. I also heard them pronounce great indulgences

over these relics, for which they never saw nor heard of

any authorization from the pope or the diocesan bishop.

They say that these are the relics of some saint. And perhaps

it is the bones of some ass or of someone who is damned that they are calling relics.

(Henry of Langenstein)[84]

[Are] all the saints who are canonized by the church in

glory, or are some of them in hell?

(Thomas Aquinas, *Quodlibet*)[85]

What is to be learned from setting these two different kinds of inquests alongside one another? From an ideological perspective, one cannot help but notice (and deplore) a bias which dictated that infinitely more care be taken, and considerably more resources spent, on awarding sanctity to the one than according infamy and sometimes death to the many. The structural perspective is equally rewarding: the alignment of the two procedures reveals howthe contours of a criminal trial were discernible in each. Viewed as a unit, the canonization and the trials for heresy form something of a slippery ladder, with rungs extending in opposite directions. Even as an ascent is generally more strenuous than a descent, so the aspiring saint might easily lose his or her footing on the steps to canonization, winding up at the bottom with the heretic. But it would take a true miracle for an individual to slip upward. The summary justice of the heretical trial versus the languorous pace of the canonization could only increase the natural inclination toward descent.

Authorities seem to have been at least tacitly aware of the slippery potential of the procedural scaffolding. One of Aquinas's most intriguing (and possibly most perplexing) quodlibetal questions raised the possibility of a canonized saint's being in hell—a predicament that he ultimately declares impossible simply because God would not let it happen. But it is telling that Aquinas does not pose (nor do I know of anyone who poses) a related question of at least parallel perplexity and of even greater likelihood: what if the church formally consigned someone to hell—that is, condemned and executed them as heretical—when, in fact, they were destined for heaven? What if the individual was not merely one of the saved but actually worthy of canonization? Perhaps this version of the question too closely approximated certain heretical contentions about the posthumous standing of their dead and, thus, was better not asked.

On the surface at least, the inquisitors responsible for assigning these categories were more scrupulous when it came to "saint" than "heretic." And the greater length of the process of canonization

reflects this, thus raising the bar for sanctity. The corresponding summary justice of the other process lowered the bar for heresy—reflecting a clear preference to err on the side of caution over permitting the guilty to escape. These divergent trends complement papal policy that strove to limit the number of saints but to eradicate all persons suspected of heresy. Yet the relative duration and rigor of the respective procedures were just epiphenomena that corroborated the general effects of the prevailing structure. The mechanism of *inquisitio* was designed to incriminate—a legacy still palpable today in countries like France, which retain a form of inquisitional process and hence begin with the assumption that the accused is guilty until proven innocent. When the *inquisitio* was applied to heresy, the tendency toward incrimination would far outweigh the tendency toward exculpation.

This inexorable valence of incrimination pertains even when the inquest is not directed by the harsh strictures of summary justice associated with conventional heretical tribunals, as the extremely protracted inquest initiated by Count Raymond VII of Toulouse seems to indicate. Raymond was embroiled in a struggle to secure a Christian burial for his heretically sympathetic father, Raymond VI (d. 1222), whose body had long remained unburied.[86] The son claimed that his father had repented on his deathbed. A procurator was appointed to plead this case in Rome, and Raymond even managed to secure Louis IX's support for his cause. (Efforts to obtain a church burial for a known heretic theoretically incurred the penalty of excommunication. By assisting in this suit, the future regal saint could theoretically have forfeited his own right to a resting place in consecrated ground.) At the behest of Gregory IX, a series of papal inquests dating as far back as 1230 had already been undertaken. Innocent IV reopened the case in 1247, making the point in his letter of commission that clear signs of penitence are sufficient to lift the stigma of excommunication should death intervene before the penitent is absolved.[87] But Raymond's petition was at length denied later in the same year, the verdict being that the father had never recanted. This decision was reached in spite of the fact that Raymond VI left substantial bequests to the Templars and Hospitallers of Toulouse in his will of 1218, expressing his intention of entering the latter order before he died; twice visited a church for prayer on the day of his sudden death; and communicated on his deathbed. Moreover, no fewer than 120 witnesses were produced at the inquest to attest to the count's charity and orthodox piety. Although the son's suit on behalf of his father was defeated, the case was never entirely put to rest. Nor was the body: neither buried nor burned, the corpse was left to rot in the house of the Hospitallers.[88]

When the *inquisitio* is turned to purposes of canonization, moreover, it is hardly surprising that the holy candidate should frequently be found wanting.With the hermeneutics of suspicion procedurally tuned to a very precise pitch, it was the rare individual (even within that very rarefied group possessed of any credible claims to sanctity) whose miracles, or even whose virtues, could remain entirely intact. In the case of women, their claims to sanctity had traditionally been associated with their bodies, usually through the preservation of their virginity. With the female mystics of the later Middle Ages, who were more prone to somatized miracles, the burden of proof continued to be located in the female body—a characteristic that channeled the evidence for their sanctity into new quasi-medical, anatomical examinations. Yet such somatized evidence often proved incapable of withstanding this level of scrutiny. A fledgling cult would often founder at the preliminary inquest.

The cult of Elena d'Oglio (d. 1520) is a case in point. Elena was a Bolognese matron, a generous benefactress of the church, and her cult was zealously promoted by her confessor, Peter of Luca. The vita Peter wrote on Elena's behalf, which was addressed to Leo X, claims that she remained a virgin throughout her twenty-nine years of marriage—only one of the many parallels that associated her with the Virgin Mary.[89] But this ascetic feat is rendered positively banal by comparison with the various claims Peter made for other aspects of her life. Elena was allegedly born in Constantinople, daughter of the emperor of the Turks and a Christian mother. She was transported to Bologna through the ministration of angels.[90] (Thus Peter proposed that a substantial part of her body should be returned to Constantinople, while the head and breast should be sent to Rome. Only a modest amount would be reserved for Bologna.)[91] Possessed of the spirit of prophecy, she was also capable of penetrating the secrets of others and knowing events at a distance.[92]

Elena's alleged sanctity was also manifested in numerous somatic ways. In 1507, Christ removed her heart and replaced it with something quite different. According to Peter, the doctor who examined her corpse, "carefully drawing her viscera aside, found indeed I do not know what in the place of the heart, but without doubt, it was very far from a true heart in shape, color, firmness, and hardness."[93] Peter later goes on to claim that Elena lived without a heart altogether, a miracle he believed entirely unparalleled in the annals of the church.[94] She often experienced considerable pain in her chest—a phenomenon that was construed as corresponding to Christ's wounds.[95] A sweet odor would issue from Elena whenever she received communion or when (in the days when she still had her heart) she experienced the burning heat of love in her breast.[96] Her

lifelong virginity was attested to and rewarded by divine lactations, wherein celestial milk filled her virginal breasts. Indeed, after her death, this fluid poured forth so abundantly from both breasts that her followers eagerly quaffed the celestial cocktail for several days.[97]

But Elena's cult was destined to remain local. Part of the problem was that Peter had clearly aimed too high, making elaborate claims for his holy penitent that stretched even the generous credulity of that age. Moreover, her case seems to have been caught in some of the cross fire exchanged between different groups of religious. Elena's cult had the supgna: port of the Lateran canons of the church of San Giovanni in Monte, of which Peter was the prior. It was here that Elena had built a chapel dedicated to Saint Cecilia and here that she was ultimately buried.[98] But a medical examination of the body was conducted to verify its state of preservation and the presence of the miraculous milk. The results were conflicted. While a number of experts were prepared to credit the claims of the canons, the Dominicans were hostile to Elena's cult, and their doctor claimed that the miraculous milk was, in fact, pus resulting from a tumor of sorts.[99] Elena's pain, the bizarre organ that took the place of her heart, and perhaps even the sweet odor were not signs of a celestial grace but symptoms of a terrestrial pathology.

Even if a cult passed its first hurdle at the diocesan level, and its promoters were successful in stimulating a papal inquiry, the cross-examination of witnesses could occasionally wobble out of control. Clare of Montefalco (d. 1308), for example, was believed to possess the instruments of the passion in her heart. This marvel was discovered soon after her death when the nuns of her community cut the body open in order to remove the entrails for better preservation. The abbess, Sister Johanna, insisted that the heart be placed in a special casket, where the organ was regarded with great reverence but was also the source of a seemingly irrepressible curiosity. The curiosity was stimulated by Clare's oftrepeated assertion that she had no need of other crosses since she bore the crucifixion in her heart, a comment that the sisters chose to interpret literally. Taking the initiative, Sister Francescha, attended by several others, cut the heart open, revealing the divinely wrought instruments of the passion.[100] The case in favor of Clare's life and sanctity was sufficiently compelling that the preliminary inquiry, begun in August 1309, eventuated in the papal inquiry, which opened in September 1318.[101]

The somatized miracle revealed in Clare's heart anticipates the parallel, albeit less spectacular, miracle wrought in Elena d'Oglio. But the case also shared in some of the attendant difficulties since Clare, too, had suffered ill-health late in life.[102] The sisters of Montefalco, however, took steps to ensure that these circumstances would not

constrain the way in which the miraculous symbols were interpreted. They took the precaution of having a properly notarized public instrument drawn up—in the presence of the *podest[agrave]* , the bishop's representative, and a throng of clerics—carefully describing the phenomenon in detail.[103] Some of the witnesses in the process also addressed the medical issues directly: thus when Simon, the doctor attending Clare at her death, was queried as to whether the marvel worked in Clare could have occurred naturally or through an illness, his assurance that neither nature nor illness could simulate these effects was overheard by a number of witnesses. The same doctor was also present to attest formally that these marvels, displayed in the presence of the assembly that attended the drafting of the public instrument, were just as he sawthem after the heart had been initially opened.[104]

Once these potential obstacles had been overcome, the process seemed to be unfolding smoothly, with the various witnesses dutifully responding to the carefully worded articles of interrogation. And then suddenly, without warning, witness 160, a certain Franciscan and onetime chaplain to Clare's community named Thomas Boni of Foligno, attempted to scuttle the bid for canonization. Thomas's testimony begins with the assertion that another Franciscan, the late John Pulicinus of Mevania, former chaplain to Clare's community during her lifetime and up until the time of her death, had openly opposed the veneration of the images revealed in Clare's heart, arguing that nothing should be adored but the cross of Christ. Thomas himself thought that the forms in Clare's heart were contrived artificially by a particular sister (he never gives her name) who lived as a recluse and was capable of doing the most intricate work with her hands. He further attempted to impugn Clare's reputation by claiming that she consorted with evil members of the clergy, and by suggesting she was something of a hedonist—eating from the best dishes, consulting the most elite doctors, and employing the most expensive medications. According to Thomas, Clare was also prone to falling on the ground—a fact clearly adduced to suggest epilepsy, possession, or both.[105]

The case of Dorothea of Montau offered a different set of challenges to John of Marienwerder, who, as we saw, was not only confessor to Dorothea but eventual procurator for her cult. The degree of control that John had exercised over Dorothea's process was on a continuum with his erstwhile control over Dorothea herself. In fact, Dorothea had ended her life in an anchorhold attached to the church of Marienwerder from where she would speak to no one without John's permission. As mentioned above, it was John who preached a sermon on her merits at her funeral, disclosing for the first time her

revelations, the extent of her austerities, and her reception of the mysterious wounds of love—all of which Dorothea had kept secret from everyone except John of Marienwerder and her alternate confessor, John's friend, the canon lawyer John Reyman.[106] (Fortunately, the deep wounds that often erupted spontaneously all over Dorothea's body causing immense pain were still in evidence when the women came to prepare Dorothea's cadaver for interment.) Through his hitherto exclusive knowledge of the wounds and their meaning, John of Marienwerder could even be said to have limited control over the somatic aspects of Dorothea's cult.

The fact that the papal inquest was opened the year of her death is a testimony to the effectiveness of John's campaign on Dorothea's behalf. It also ensured the presence of certain star witnesses, such as the canonist John Reyman and the bishop of Pomerania, John Moïnch —both of whom had interrogated Dorothea during her lifetime in order to assure themselves of her orthodoxy.[107] But most of Dorothea's life had been spent in her native town of Danzig, where she lived in relative obscurity.[108] John Marienwerder had, in fact, been Dorothea's confessor for only the last three years of her life, corresponding to her arrival in Marienwerder. Many of the individuals who had known Dorothea in Danzig were still alive and prepared to testify at her process—testimony that John could not possibly control or even anticipate. And one especially ominous fact did present itself. When addressing a certain article concerning the various adversities that Dorothea had endured, several witnesses deposed that Dorothea had formerly been charged with heresy—an occurrence that was widely known among the contingent from Danzig.[109] According to her confessor from Danzig, Nicholas of Hohenstein, the bishop's official for the diocese of W3oc3awek, along with certain other priests, threatened "to burn her, because they heard from people certain unknown things [*incognita*] told about Dorothea and they believed she erred."[110] John had made no explicit mention of the charges of heresy in the many lives he wrote on behalf of his holy penitent, except by way of allusion. In any event, such charges, even if unjustified, could nevertheless serve to damage an individual's *fama*.[111]

Both Clare and Dorothea were eventually canonized, although they had to wait until the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, respectively, for the conferral of this honor.[112] Despite their eventual successes, these cases demonstrate howthe rigors of interrogation might unearth information that could immediately bring the process to a grinding halt.

Yet the unwelcome revelations that might surface in the course of an inquest into sanctity are only a symptom of the endemic problem of adopting the inquisition for purposes of canonization in the first

place, and thereby establishing a commonality of procedure in the determination of saints and heretics alike. Of course, the impulses to exalt and to stigmatize are inevitably linked as two polarities. Nevertheless, the *inquisitio* constituted a covert bridge that united the two procedures in an unprecedented way, exploiting the natural relation of opposites and facilitating a series of surprising reversals that could undercut or transform the mission of a given tribunal. Thus efforts made with a view to the commendation of a saint could result in the condemnation of a heretic.

The celebrated instances of Armannus Punzilupus of Ferrara and Guglielma of Milan, both of which came to a head in the troubled pontificate of Boniface VIII, demonstrate the potential for slippage between the two kinds of inquisition.[113] Armannus was a pious layman of Ferrara, who died in 1269.114 A large crowd immediately gathered, and his body wasduly laid to rest in the cathedral with honor and devotion. Placed in an ancient sarcophagus that was ensconced within a separate chapel, the body immediately began to work miracles. Between 1269 and 1280, the bishop of Ferrara in collaboration with the canons launched a total of five separate inquests into the miracles attributed to Armannus's intervention. 115 But soon these inquiries attracted the attention of the prior of the Dominican chapter, Aldobrandinus, who, in his capacity as inquisitor of heresy, was familiar with Armannus. Aldobrandinus not only remembered Armannus as a former heretic but had reason to believe that he had relapsed into heresy after his abjuration before the inquisitional tribunal. When the canons disobeyed the inquisitor's order to have the body disinterred and removed from the church, Aldobrandinus responded with an excommunication of the canons and an interdict on the cathedral.

The canons appealed to Rome, including in their petition an impressive number of attestations to the piety and exemplary confessional habits of Armannus by the various eminent priests to whom he had confessed over the years.[116] And at first, the results seemed promising: the case was entrusted to Cardinal Johannes of San Nicolo, who ordered that Aldobrandinus lift the sentence of excommunication from the canons and the interdict from the cathedral. The inquisitor obeyed but retaliated by opening a rival inquest into Armannus's life.[117] The two inquests—one attempting to prove his sanctity and the other bent on his condemnation for heresy—finally converged in a papal inquiry of 1300. The case is preserved via the papal inquisitors' summary of the different stages of the proceedings, a dossier that Carol Lansing has aptly characterized as a veritable *Sic et Non* on the subject of Armannus's spiritual allegiance.[118] At length, while acknowledging that certain *acta* had

been lost, the papal judges arrived at the verdict that Armannus was indeed a relapsed heretic "even though he exhibited many miracles."[119] One can well imagine the consternation of the papal tribunal when confronted by the fact that Armannus seemed possessed of the one feature that was supposed to be the surest mechanism for determining who was or was not a saint: the presence of miracles after death. Canon lawhad reposed considerable trust in this distinction. The secret consistory on Peter of Morrone's case, occurring five years subsequent to Armannus's drama, says explicitly that "miracles performed after death are special arguments of a final [*finalis*] good and holy life."[120] But saint or no saint, in 1301 the canons were ordered to exhume and burn Armannus's remains.[121] This did not entirely put an end to the matter for the church: the continuation of miracles caused some Catholic historians to interpret Armannus's posthumous thaumaturgical powers as a divine testimony of sanctity that must needs triumph over ecclesiastical condemnation. [122]

Even had Armannus's faith been vindicated, the fact that he was still associated with Catharism by at least some members of the laity was an immense liability. As his orthodox critics complain in the course of the papal inquest, his heretical cult was the cause for rejoicing among Cathars, who were thrilled that one of their own was finally being recognized for his sanctity. A stream of heretical pilgrims was said to have converged from all over Europe, basking in the orthodox authorities' unexpected appreciation. Indeed, certain Cathars were even faking miraculous cures in order to bolster Armannus's already sufficiently impressive record.[123]

More striking still is the case of Guglielma of Milan, whose orthodox cult provided an even more satisfactory screen for its heretical twin, and whose case thus deserves particular consideration. The center of the cult, Guglielma (d. ca. 1281), was and probably will remain something of a mystery. It is not simply that her relative orthodoxy or heterodoxy is perhaps even more obscure than in the case of Armannus, but her very past is equally impenetrable. Guglielma arrived in Milan around 1260—a middle-aged woman in her fifties with a son, and reputed to be the daughter of the king of Bohemia. As the example of Elena d'Oglio suggests, many would-be saints are provided with precisely this kind of exotic background, either by themselves or by their disciples. What is different in this case, however, is that the tale was true. Yet why she came to Milan is entirely unknown, as are the specific circumstances she left behind. One can only assume that she sought a life of relative anonymity and simplicity, which she clearly believed could be found in urban Lombardy.

But her lineage was probably the only flashy aspect of Guglielma's

external life. She lived in a humble but not wildly ascetic manner, dressed in plain brown robes, performing charitable acts, and surrounded by a circle of admirers. Guglielma had close associations with the Cistercian monastery of Chiaravalle, to which she left her property when she died. She had expressed a wish to be buried in the Cistercian church, a wish that could not immediately be satisfied owing to a local political skirmish with Lodi. When it was possible to move her body from its temporary resting place in the cemetery in Milan several months later, her reputation for sanctity was sufficiently robust for the simple transferral of a body to become a translation of relics, while the monks themselves entertained hopes of having her officially canonized.[124]

The orthodox contingent who venerated Guglielma as a local saint were shadowed by an alternative following led by Andreas Samarita, a well-to-do citizen of Milan, and his associate, the Humiliata Mayfreda de Pirovano.[125] Probably reacting to the malaise generated by Boniface VIII's troubled pontificate, in conjunction with contemporary Joachimite inflections, Andreas came to the conclusion that Guglielma was the Holy Ghost incarnate, and won Mayfreda over to this conviction as well.[126] Guglielma's advent was believed to have inaugurated the Third Age of the Spirit, signaling the end of the corrupt present-day church and the establishment of a newone in its stead. This new church would be governed by a female pope, who was to be none other than Mayfreda herself.[127] By 1300, rumors of the sect were rife, attracting the attention of the inquisitors. The ensuing inquisitional record is fragmentary: testimonies for thirty people remain, although there were probably not many more members in the sect. Only one sentence is meted out in the course of the record, but it is often not difficult to infer the fate of others.[128] For instance, a certain Ricadona is introduced as Andreas's *widow*. In the course of the cross-examination about her beliefs, the inquisitor suddenly loses focus and asks how much wine there was in the house when Andreas was arrested—an ominous sign with its attendant implications that Andreas did not die a natural death, and that the family's property was in jeopardy as a result. All in all, probably four or five of the sectarians were eventually burned, while a number of the others were made to wear penitential crosses.[129]

The trial of the Guglielmites is something of a showcase for just how the inquisitional procedure assisted in forging newlinks between saint and heretic. As a result of this conflation, the proceedings in their entirety read very much like a canonization gone wrong. The inquisitor stands in the place of procurator, only in this inverted canonization his purpose is to vilify as opposed to vindicate Guglielma's *fama* as holy. He makes his case by interrogating her

followers—witnesses to both her sanctity of life and her miracles. And indeed, much of the interrogation, in terms of both questions and answers, would still be suitable for a genuine canonization process. During Andreas's first interrogation, for example, when asked how Guglielma conducted herself during her lifetime, he responds that she lived a common life, sharing food, drink, and even clothing. Asked if he has ever heard of Guglielma's having performed miracles during her lifetime, he answers yes and goes on to describe them. Did she perform miracles after her death? he is asked, and so on.[130] The bitter irony of this dialogue is the cross-purposes of inquisitor and witness. The situation is framed in such a way that many of the witness's constrained, but genuine, attestations to Guglielma's sanctity will ultimately contribute to the inquisitor's case for her heretical depravity.

Within the larger structure of this inverted canonization, another process unfolds: the sectarians' struggle to manifest their own recognition of Guglielma's divinity. This initiative, which, faute de mieux, hugs the contours of a more conventional case for sanctity, might be perceived as an opera buffa version of a legitimate process of canonization, if only its implications were not so tragic. Thus we learn that Andreas journeyed to the court of Bohemia, first to verify that Guglielma was who she said she was, but also intending to inform the king of his daughter's demise, with some hopes of reimbursement for the money expended in her honor. When the inquisitors asked whether the motive for the journey was to enlist the king in an attempt to have Guglielma canonized, after some initial hedging Andreas eventually acknowledged that this was so. His demurral may indicate that he had a very different kind of canonization in mind, the nature of which had to be concealed from the inquisitors at all costs. Andreas, however, soon understood that framing his movements in terms of a conventional canonization was surely the safest route. Not only was this framework comprehensible to the inquisitors, who were aware of the monks' ambitions for Guglielma, but since the investigation was still in its preliminary stages, they may not yet have understood fully where Cistercian and sectarian aims parted company. So if one were to seek an important sponsor for the cult, who better than Guglielma's father, the king of Bohemia?[131] The fact that Andreas was accompanied by Myranus, chaplain to the Milanese church of Saint Firmus, lent a sheen of orthodoxy to the mission. Unfortunately, the king had died, and they came away empty-handed.[132]

Guglielma's supporters also recognized that miracles were essential to establishing her cult. This was problematical because the miracles performed thus far had been less than impressive. Of the ones

occurring in her lifetime, the most noteworthy was Guglielma's alleged reception of the stigmata—although the wounds were not visible at the time of her death, which was surely a disappointment to her followers.[133] But her active intervention on behalf of others was also thin. Andreas reported on the basis of hearsay alone that Guglielma had cured someone of an unspecified eye problem and yet another person of a kind of ulcer (*fistula*), giving the names of the beneficiaries for these miracles. The crucial miracles after death, however, were lacking. When asked directly about Guglielma's prowess in this arena, Andreas demurred, responding that certain ladies claimed their prayers to Guglielma were always answered. Another witness would volunteer that on several occasions, when suffering from an unspecified illness, she had made a vowto Guglielma and experienced relief.[134]

But the best-attested miracle occurred during an after-dinner gathering at which Mayfreda made the memorable declaration that Guglielma was the Holy Spirit incarnate. At a certain point in the evening Lady Carabella stood up and discovered three knots in her belt that had not been there before: "and there was great wonder and murmuring among them. And many believed that this was a great miracle, as did the witness."[135] To supplement this rather feeble showing, Andreas and Mayfreda may have resorted to staging miracles. The chaplain, Myranus, heard that the brothers (*fratres*) had bound Andreas hand and foot to Guglielma's tomb, but he was released with the saint's intervention. Similarly, when the brothers (*fratres*) attempted to catch Mayfreda, an angel was deployed in her defense, "drawing a bloody sword hither and thither."[136]

The other standard accoutrements of a canonization were also in evidence. There were two overt feasts that the sectarians celebrated alongside her orthodox advocates: the day of her death, which coincided with Saint Bartholomew's Day (24 August) and the day her body was translated to the Cistercian abbey, occurring at the end of October.[137] Some of the sectarians added a covert third: Pentecost—the day set for her return, which also coincided with the day of her birth.[138] Andreas wrote the requisite vita that was pivotal to the dossier of every saint.[139] Nor were the ritual aspects of the cult in abeyance. Mayfreda wrote and staged special litanies on Guglielma's behalf.[140] Songs were composed and sung in her praise.[141] Moreover, the Guglielmites went to considerable lengths, not to mention great expense, to acquire what they deemed to be appropriate liturgical dress and paraphernalia. There were altar cloths, vestments, and implements for the mass made especially for Guglielma's altar.[142] The sectarians were also careful to provide Guglielma with what they took to be the suitable trappings for her divinity. Garments of gold cloth,

covered by a sumptuous purple robe with silver clasps, were prepared for the body. Some of the devoted said they believed that this costume was in readiness for when her relics were ceremoniously removed to Bohemia in anticipation of the formal translation that usually follows official canonization, but others stated that this garb was prepared for Guglielma's imminent resurrection from the dead—an event that could occur any time within three to twelve years, depending upon whom you consulted.[143]

The Guglielmites showed particular flair in their devotional habits.[144] For instance, hosts were placed on her tomb and then devoutly eaten.[145] Special care was taken of the saint's body. About a month after the translation to Chiaravalle, Andreas removed Guglielma's cadaver from its casket and carried it into the church of the Cistercian lay brethren (*conversi*) where, in the presence of many clerics and laypersons, he devoutly washed it in water and wine. The liquid retained from this ablution was to be used as chrism for anointing Guglielma's devoted and was sent to Mayfreda for this purpose. (And we are told that Mayfreda would go on to anoint many of the sick with this concoction.) In a gesture reminiscent of the loving attentions showered on Elisabeth of Hungary's body, Andreas carefully clothed Guglielma's body in a shift of embroidered silk (*camisia laborata de sita*) and an alb made from a woolen scapular, donated by one of the monks.[146] Certain other Guglielmite practices were more conventional, as, for instance, when Mayfreda proclaimed an indulgence to those who visited Guglielma's tomb—an exorbitant one that was explicitly compared to the famed plenary indulgence granted to crusaders.[147]

Finally, as if through a translucent screen, one can discern a third process: the orthodox efforts to have Guglielma canonized. Her translation into the Cistercian church and the assignation of specific feast days are the clearest indications of this ongoing endeavor. Moreover, it is mentioned in passing that images of Guglielma were hung in various churches throughout Milan.[148] The inquisitional record is also replete with numerous references to monastic preaching about Guglielma's merits and the monks' sponsorship of various solemnities on her feast days.[149] Indeed, the very zeal of Cistercian devotion fostered a decided symbiosis between the two different levels of veneration, the nature of which makes it difficult to perceive where the one ends and the other begins. H. C. Lea, the great scholar of the inquisition, is convinced that the monks' complicity with sectarian devotion runs so deep that it is a marvel that none of them is among the condemned.[150] Yet I believe that the Cistercian "complicity," although real, was probably contained within orthodox boundaries. It is true that the Cistercians were very eager to have a saint. Some of

this desire was doubtless prompted by the kind of mercenary incentives that the chronicler Salimbene sneeringly attributed to the various sponsors of a recent pseudosaint, Albert the Wine Carrier.[151] But such motives can and do coincide with a sincere awareness of the spiritual benefits that a saint can impart to the entire region. A successful bid for the canonization of their patroness would necessarily founder, however, without the enthusiastic support of the local community. Naturally the Cistercians were prepared to welcome fervent testimonials to the sectarians' devotion, even if this meant overlooking certain excesses. Moreover, the Guglielmites were hardly the marginal riffraff frequently associated with urban heresies: on the contrary, many were solid members of the citizenry, both wealthy and respected.[152]

The Guglielmites' perception of their relationship with the monks was equally complex. The sectarians were dependent on the orthodox cult for their own safety. Thus it is something of a surprise that the Cistercian cult is occasionally glimpsed through a door opened by sectarian hostility. Some of this tension results from the rivalry that one might expect between the two groups. With their penchant for drama, Andreas and Mayfreda may have capitalized on these tensions in the mock miracles they staged, in which they are persecuted by certain "brothers"—a scenario alluded to earlier.[153] More dire tensions between the two groups also arose, which could not be dispelled by mere playacting. Some of the sectarians came to feel that excessive *Cistercian* devotion was responsible for attracting the unwelcome attention of the inquisition. This is certainly implied in a conversation between Andreas and the tertiary Franciscan Girardus de Novazano, immediately following the latter's interrogation. Girardus warns Andreas to be careful, adding that "the brothers of Clairvaux were wrong to compare the aforesaid saint Guglielma to the moon and stars in their preachings and to receive offerings and candles on behalf of Guglielma."[154] Only now were the sectarians realizing that, while the screen of zealous monastic devotion had hitherto kept them safe, the time had arrived when it could only expose them to danger.

Hitherto I have been focusing on the accusations against the sectarians and the voluntary or involuntary complicity of the monks. But this was Guglielma's trial as well. Moreover, should she be found guilty, her body would be exhumed and burned, while the monks, as her heirs, would doubtless have to forfeit her bequest.[155] Various scholars have asserted that Guglielma herself was, in all likelihood, perfectly orthodox—a view that may well be correct.[156] And yet when the two concurrent cults are viewed from the outside, and their very many points of contact fully appreciated, one could legitimately suppose that Guglielma's orthodox supporters had, in fact, mistaken a

heretic for a saint. This might have been the perspective of the inquisitors, who may have seen in the Cistercian veneration of Guglielma a misapprehension akin to the one formed by the hapless canons supporting Armannus—a drama whose denouement was playing itself out in the very same year further south. And, as with Armannus, there was even a rumor afoot that Guglielma had been summoned before the inquisition.[157]

But equally important is that by the end of their testimony, the heretical ringleaders had thoroughly implicated the (perhaps involuntary) foundress of the sect in charges of heresy. Thus while Andreas, the sectarian most familiar with Guglielma, initially denied both that Guglielma had ever told him that she was the Holy Spirit and that he had ever reported to anyone her having said this, he would eventually confess that it was Guglielma herself who had made this claim. According to this later testimony, Guglielma promised, in due course, to descend from the sky onto her marble tomb, amid thunder and lightning. Moreover, after recapitulating the sectarians' views, Andreas explicitly affirmed "that he received to a great extent the foundation of these errors from Guglielma." He was responsible only for the finishing touches to add "ornament and credulity to the aforesaid errors."[158]

There were other depositions supporting Andreas's incrimination of Guglielma, which probably constituted sufficient corroboration for the inquisitors, and Andreas is almost invariably associated with each of these testimonies.[159] Andreas first told the sectarian Sibilia, for example, that Guglielma not only said she was the Holy Spirit but went on to explain that, had she been born a male, she would have ended up dying just as Christ had, and the entire world would have perished.[160] According to the cleric Francischus de Garbagniate, Guglielma told Mayfreda and Andreas that after 1262 (the current year) it would no longer be the body of Christ alone that was being consecrated at mass, but the body of Christ united with the body of Guglielma, the Holy Spirit. As a result, Guglielma was indifferent to gazing at the reserved host or even attending mass, devotions that she regarded as unnecessarily narcissistic. But once again, the sole sources for this story were Andreas and Mayfreda.[161]

Yet despite Mayfreda's alleged role in the above scenario, and Andreas's vigorous assertions that Mayfreda had told him many times that she had heard Guglielma herself claim to be the Holy Spirit, this is not at all clear from independent testimonies.[162] It was widely recounted that Mayfreda received directly from Guglielma herself a mandate to reveal her divine persona—a command that is duly carried out at that celebrated common meal among the faithful. Even so it is apparent from the testimony of at least two of these witnesses that

Mayfreda received this command in the course of a vision.[163] Indeed, some of the clearest evidence that Guglielma harbored no illusions of divinity comes from Mayfreda herself. Thus in the course of her third interrogation:

> When Sister Mayfreda was asked if she ever heard from holy Guglielma that she was the Holy Spirit, she answered that she had not heard it from Guglielma herself, but sometimes when the holy Guglielma was asked by some person to remove a tribulation, or sorrow, or something of the kind, the same Guglielma responded: “Go away! I am not God.”[164]

Other testimonies corroborate Guglielma’s vehement “not God” stance. Even though the sectarian Alegrantia was present at the postprandial meeting alluded to above, her own experience contradicts Mayfreda’s claims on Guglielma’s behalf. In fact, Alegrantia reputedly questioned Guglielma herself about Andreas’s panegyrics. After hearing the gist of what he had said, Guglielma immediately denounced such talk, addingthat she was nothing but a vile woman, a vile worm, even[165] On anotheroccasion she apparently said to Andreas directly, “ ‘You are crazy forwhat you say and believe about me, which just isn’t true. I was born of aman and a woman!’ ” Yet again, an exasperated Guglielma was said tohave asserted vigorously that she was flesh and bones, had even givenbirth to a son, and her misguided devotees would go straight to hell unlessthey did penance for their beliefs.[166]

And yet, as Stephen Wessley points out, Guglielma neither denouncednor even cut off relations with Andreas, who was clearly more intimatewith her than the rest. Moreover, Andreas’s ultimate implication of Guglielma,almost certainly a by-product of torture, could be read in a numberof ways. He may have been attempting to save his own skin, believinghe would be dealt with less harshly if he were not believed to be the originatorof the error. Or it may be that Andreas’s eventual indictment of Guglielmawas true: perhaps be was determined to protect Guglielma’s reputationfor as long as he was able, recognizing that if she were found heretical,her body would be destroyed and, with it, the sectarians’ eschatologicaland soteriological dreams.[167] It is impossible to know. But whatever thetruth may be concerning Guglielma’s orthodoxy, the monks were takinga definite risk in promoting her cult. In addition to Guglielma’s own possiblehistory with the inquisitors, her followers had experienced more thanone brush with the inquisition. Andreas and Mayfreda were betrayed tothe inquisitors inadvertently by a couple of fellow Guglielmites around1284, although it is difficult to ascertain how much the inquisitorslearned.We do know,however, that an inquisitor returned and questionedsome of the members of the sect as late as 1296.[168]

Whether or not the inquisitors were themselves genuinely perplexed over the nature of Guglielma's beliefs, it was all too apparent that any continued veneration of Guglielma was anathema. This meant that her body would not be allowed to rest peacefully. According to Bernard Gui, a parallel problem had arisen contemporaneously with the illicit cult that developed around the Franciscan theologian Peter John Olivi (d. 1298), whose body eventually had to be exhumed and hidden.[169] Practical considerations such as these may have tilted the scales of justice in favor of Guglielma's condemnation from the outset. And she was, of course, condemned. What, retrospectively, seems an inevitable conclusion to this pathetic episode receives inflected, but poignant, mention during the interrogation of Marchixius Sichi, a person identified as living in the monastery of Chiaravalle—probably as a *conversus*, although perhaps an actual monk. Marchixius was one of the several witnesses who recounted how Guglielma forcefully refuted attributions of divinity, an anecdote that immediately provoked the inquisitors to pose a leading question: "Asked if he spoke ill of those who caused the body of the said Guglielma to be burned, or if he believed they acted badly, he answered no, nor did he concern himself about her, but said he was glad that it would not harm her, if she was in paradise."[170]

We thus learn that the body was, indeed, burned, and the inquisitors, recognizing that Marchixius's deposition indicated that he could not possibly believe Guglielma to be a heretic, cunningly deployed the disposal of her remains as an instrument for gauging heterodox leanings. But whatever private conclusions the inquisitors might have drawn about the sympathies of the defendant, there was no denying the truth of his spirited answer. For Marchixius Sichi had given the only correct answer to my tacit quodlibet that flows like an underground stream throughout Armannus's and Guglielma's contested cases alike. What if a saint, who deserved to be canonized, were burned as a heretic instead? For Armannus and Guglielma, both dead and at peace, ecclesiastical condemnation would make no difference whatsoever. Indeed, had they been alive for their sentence, and subsequently burned, such a martyrdom would only have won them merit.

Thus in the event that Guglielma was unjustly condemned, Marchixius drewco mfort from the distinction between the church militant and the church triumphant. On the face of it, one could hardly suppose that the same discrepancy was the source of solace for the ecclesiastical authorities, however; it must rather have been one of considerable consternation. As Raymond of PeÑafort had so forcefully proclaimed in the canonization of Elisabeth of Hungary, the correspondence between the judgments of the church militant and the

church triumphant was central to confounding heretics.[171] Indeed, the potential for conflict between earthly and heavenly tribunals is often construed as undercutting church discipline by reminding the faithful that there was always a higher justice—the only one to which an Antigone, or, better still, a Joan of Arc, was prepared to submit. Yet it would be wrong to assume that all differences between the church militant and the church triumphant work to the disadvantage of the former. The theory of the two churches was cut from generous cloth and could be fitted to many shapes. From a certain perspective, Marchixius's answer was on a continuum with the monstrous piety of the papal legate Arnaud, abbot of Citeaux, who encountered a real-life approximation of my hypothetical quodlibet during the Albigensian Crusade. In answer to the conundrum of howto proceed against the besieged city of Béziers, harboring a conglomeration of heretical and orthodox inhabitants, he allegedly advised, " 'Kill them all, for the Lord knoweth themthat are His (2 Tim. 2.19)!' "[172] In fact, Marchixius's potentially subversive answer could also be used to palliate, or even justify, any act of violence.

Hitherto I have been making the argument that the inquest into sanctity was charged with a negative valence, tending toward incrimination. But the pattern we have been examining could also operate in reverse, such that an inquiry opened with the expectation of exposing heresy or possible fraud could be transformed into a vindication of an individual's sanctity. When news spread of the miracle that God had worked on the heart of Clare of Montefalco, for example, the suspicions of Berengar of SaintAffrique, the bishop's *officialis*, were raised, and he went to investigate. According to her vita, Berengar's action was prompted when the sisters were denounced for fraud by a certain Peter of Salomon. (The hagiographer accordingly impugns Peter as a heretic associated with the Spiritual Franciscans, who was attempting to obscure the miracle.)[173] As it happened, however, this denunciation precipitated another miracle: Berengar pricked his finger on the iron-hard miniature lance that had been found in Clare's heart, and was immediately converted to the sisters' cause. Thereafter he was an ardent proponent for the efficacy of the marvel wrought in Clare, and eventual procurator for her case.[174]

The reversal occasioned in Clare's situation occurred at an early stage, before the different mechanisms of a full-scale process were set in motion. Suspicious or not, church authorities were still very far from reaching a verdict. The only instance of a 360-degree revolution, whereby a condemned heretic becomes an officially canonized saint, occurs in the celebrated case of Joan of Arc—condemned in 1431, but eventually canonized in 1920. Thus if Guglielma raises the specter of a

convicted heretic's being worthy of canonization, Joan is its realization. But Joan's situation is singular. Although ecclesiastical authorities assisted in the rehabilitation that was conducted some twenty years after her death, one would not expect them to realize, much less publish, the full extent of their misrecognition for a long time. That the complete transformation from heretic to saint took half a millennium to effect is a clear indication of ecclesiastical reluctance. Yet once this revolution was underway, Joan's inquisitional records aided both rehabilitation and canonization alike. This pattern defies the professed purpose of such records, which were intended to facilitate the persecution of repeat offenders and their families long after their relatives' actual death. Nevertheless, the fact that evidence from Joan's trial for heresy could be so easily mobilized in her case for sanctity is further testimony to the bridge created by the inquisitional process. The many uncanny qualities that contributed to Joan's downfall—the voices, the divine mission, the prophetic powers—could be reapplied to her elevation. But the singularity of Joan's case bears reiterating. Inquests were designed to incriminate. Thus the traffic on the bridge tended to flowin one direction.

ORTHODOX HERETIC, HERETICAL MARTYR

> At the present time, our faithful work marvels, while the
>
> others suffer evil; but later, however, the satellites of this
>
> Behemoth [i.e., Antichrist], even though they introduce
>
> evil, will work marvels. We should weigh carefully the temptation to the human mind when the pious martyr subjects his body to torture, while the torturer works miracles before his eyes. Whose virtue is not shaken by
>
> that abyss of thought, when he who torments with scourges glitters with signs?
>
> (Gregory the Great, *Moralia*)[175]
>
> The children of the holy spirit were dispersed and
>
> put in prison.
>
> (From Andreas Samarita's psalter)[176]

Papal canonization instituted a gap between official and popular sanctity that would widen in the course of the Middle Ages.[177] It also ensured that papal authority was experienced in a new way. For officially canonized saints were distinguished not only by the publicity or ubiquity of their cults but, equally important, by their impact on how these cults must be regarded. As a result of the status of canonized saints, their cults became invested with a coercive charge.[178] To challenge the various claims of a papally canonized

saint could have the same ramifications as questioning religious dogma, likewise provoking disciplinary action. This point can be made with respect to what is doubtless one of the most celebrated miracles of the entire Middle Ages—the reception of the stigmata by Saint Francis. It is certainly significant that although Francis died in 1226 and was canonized almost immediately in 1228—actually bypassing a papal inquest altogether since his case for sanctity was so apparent179—his friend and admirer Gregory IX withheld papal recognition of the stigmata until 1237, when he finally published the bull *Universis Christi fidelibus*. [180] Even Bonaventure alludes to papal hesitation in the order's official life of Francis.[181] And yet having once bestowed its imprimatur on the stigmata, the papacy was prepared to police its decision, which was not an easy task. The stigmata continued to inspire considerable incredulity, even within the Franciscan order itself. Thus between 1237 and 1291, there were a total of nine papal bulls denouncing skeptics.[182]

Occasionally, a scholar would take up the cause. Thus the Franciscan Peter Thomas, writing sometime between 1310 and 1330, undertakes to prove that the stigmata could not have been produced through natural means but must have been imposed supernaturally through God.[183] One of the greatest challenges to his contention was the truly impressive powers attributed to the imagination. This faculty was widely believed to have the capacity to trick the senses into perceiving things that were not actually there. Moreover, substantial somatic changes were often attributed to the powers of imagination, the classic case being the ability of a mother's fantasies to impose themselves on the fetus.[184] But Peter argues against such imaginative scope, especially resisting the view that the imagination could affect solid or bounded matter, as would have to be the case with any piercing of the body. By rejecting the possibility of imaginative somatism, Peter was prepared to go up against medical authorities such as Avicenna.[185]

Peter's several conclusions, and the order in which they appear, are especially revelatory of a certain kind of orthodox mind-set. The conclusions move from traditional scholastic proof, to the nature of the symbolic investment, to the manner in which this investment is protected. Thus the first proof recapitulates the limits of the imagination, further averring that, were the imagination possessed of such penetrating powers, the stigmata would not have been withheld from the Virgin Mary, whose empathy with Christ's sufferings could hardly have been less than that of Francis. 186 The second conclusion is not really a conclusion at all but rather a revealing series of meditations on what the reception of the stigmata represents. Thus Francis is like a soldier, singled out and rewarded for his unique

strength. He is comparable to a standard-bearer, appointed by a lord to carry his symbol. Francis is like a legate, entrusted with a papal bull. A venerable duke needs certain signs worthy of reverence, and Francis is himself such a duke. Even as goodness, perfection, and sanctity are declared through a sign, so the virtues of Francis are declared through the stigmata. Finally, a lover must needs communicate with his beloved: thus the stigmata represent Christ's communication with his beloved Francis. It is worth noting that only in the last three points do the stigmata begin to signify the spiritual prowess of Francis in his own right, an emphasis that is permitted to emerge once the stigmata are used to establish his subordination first to the Lord and then to the pope.[187]

The symbol of Francis as a papal legate is both situationally and ideologically at the center of this series of similes, heralded by the preceding points and adumbrated by the subsequent ones.[188] The legate was, by this period, an arm of the pope—not only authorized to act on the pope's behalf, but further upholding and representing the full weight of papal dignity and authority. And the full import of the identification of Francis as legate ultimately presages the fourth and last conclusion, which is undoubtedly the most compelling in every sense of the word, but also the most frighteningly simple. To assert that the stigmata were not supernaturally imposed is heretical.[189] Such a conclusion sets the limits on scholarly debate and serves as a reminder that this inquiry, like the majority of scholastic exercises, simply aspires to proving (and thereby confirming) an already established point of dogma. Thus its status as a compulsory belief is not only the starting point for discussion but a final trump card when all else fails.

But if Peter's conclusions were scholastic, not all of them were purely "academic" in the dismissive sense of the term. To deny the efficacy of the stigmata was not only heretical in theory; it could also be treated as such. In 1361, the Silvestrine monk Brother Leonardus of Foligno tested this principle, only to prove it true. Leonardus not only challenged the stigmata but chose to do so before an unpropitious audience—a group of Franciscan nuns, who doubtless denounced him to the inquisitors. The document that results from the ensuing inquisition is, once again, comparable to a bizarrely inverted parody of the depositions attesting to the miracles of a saint for purposes of canonization. In this instance, however, the witnesses testify to the fact that the defendant was doing his own testifying *against* a papally confirmed miracle. The inquisitorial task is thus oriented toward garnering proof of heretical depravity, not sanctity.

According to the depositions of the nuns, the sole witnesses who testified, Brother Leonardus not only opposed the veneration of the

stigmata in theory, which he argued set Francis up as a new God;[190] he also thought that the stigmata themselves were faked. Although Leonardus may have made these claims more than once,[191] on at least one memorable occasion a number of witnesses were present. Leonardus's remarks were prompted by a sermon that he heard concerning the life and miracles of Francis. His injudicious response was to assert not only that the friars themselves were responsible for the stigmata, but that Francis was complicit. Francis maliciously permitted himself to fall out of an olive tree (*de quadam oliva turpiter cecidit*), thus creating wounds that the brothers supplemented with paint.[192] This was done solely for gain (*propter lucrum*).[193] A rather plodding empiricist, Leonardus further questioned how Francis could possibly have obtained the stigmata in any event, since he was never crucified. Moreover, why is it, Leonardus asked, that John the Evangelist or holy James never merited these signs of devotion, if we are to believe that Francis did?[194] Leonardus thus concluded that Francis and his followers alike were deserving of excommunication for their ruse.[195] The audience was not particularly receptive to such freewheeling speculation: a certain Corradus Martini, after arguing with Leonardus for some time, finally became exasperated and popped him in the jaw. The commotion attracted the attention of the majority of the sisters, who came running out of the convent to learn the meaning of this fracas.[196]

Leonardus eventually backed down. He confessed to the inquisitors that what he had said was not intentionally heretical but resulted from a mere slip of the tongue and a lack of deliberation (*dicit se non dixisse mente heretica sed lassu lingue et ex indeliberatione*), and he was assigned appropriate penance.[197] But the cult of Francis was not the only official cult that suffered from disaffection. The cults of the two most famous inquisitors, Peter Martyr and Dominic (who, while predating the actual appointments of inquisitors, was widely perceived as one), required constant vigilance. The revolt against the inquisition staged by the people of Albi in 1302, witnessed and described by inquisitor Bernard Gui, was marked by a substitution of images: those of Dominic and Peter Martyr were replaced by two of the rebel leaders. The restoration of the inquisitor- saints occurred only when the rebellion was quelled.[198] Many papal bulls and acts of the Dominican chapter further attest to the difficulty of policing the cults surrounding these inquisitors. Papal defensiveness would be redoubled with regard to Dominic and Peter Martyr, for the Dominicans, like the Franciscans, had special ties to the papacy—ties that freed the mendicants from local authorities and made them answerable to the pope alone. Moreover, the inquisition itself existed in an even more complete symbiosis with the papacy. Thus skepticism

with regard to these inquisitor-saints became associated with heresy: at least one inquisitional manual posed as a question for interrogation whether suspects truly believed that Dominic and Peter Martyr were saints.[199]

Nor did this mantle of protection pertain only to saintly inquisitors; it was, not surprisingly, extended to the office itself. Individuals who refused to cooperate with the inquisitors were treated as heretics, as were those who expressed doubts over the validity of the tribunal. For example, in the course of the inquisition against the Cathars undertaken in Bologna between 1291 and 1310, individuals were indicted for challenging the inquisitors' right to excommunicate or to confiscate property. Some of them denied the efficacy of the death penalty. Others attempted to turn the tables by claiming that those who experienced trouble and tribulation at the hands of the inquisitors won considerable merit with God.[200] A certain Recevutus basterius asserted that the friars sinned in condemning anyone, even heretics, and that relinquishing them to the secular arm was a sin against God. "Howcan this be since Godwishes and ordained justice be done on earth?" asked Corbicincus, the witness responsible for reporting the conversation. Recevutus answered: "That is not so, because God did not ordain this, nor did he wish it to be done thus."One defendant thought the inquisitors deserved burning along with Saint Dominic, even if the latter could be burned only in effigy.[202] Many believed that the inquisitors "made men into heretics [*fratres faciebant homines hereticos*]"; others that the inquisitors "were greater heretics than the said Bompetrus [*erant magis heretici quam dictus Bompetrus*]," a notorious Cathar who had just been condemned and burned.[203] A large proportion of witnesses expressed outrage at the burning of the bones of a certain Rosaflora, a former heretic who received the sacrament on her deathbed, arguing that her condemnation was for monetary gain alone.[204] Similarly, in the contemporaneous trial of the Guglielmites, the inquisitors became aware of a rumor that they themselves had been suspended from office and had no authority—a story abetted by the local Franciscans, whose antagonism to their Dominican confreres was typical of the rivalry between the two orders. The inquisitors simply incorporated the rumor into their cross-examinations, using it as yet another touchstone for heresy.[205]

The Franciscan Bernard Délicieux, the impetus behind the revolt of the people of Albi alluded to above, probably constitutes the most famous instance of clerical resistance to the inquisition. After a career of activism that spanned some twenty years, Bernard was eventually tried and degraded by Dominican inquisitors in 1319—an insufficient punishment in the view of Gui, who reports that "he was punished,

but not fully."[206] But clerical opposition to the inquisition was hardly limited to intermendicant hostilities and could be as subtle as it was ubiquitous. Thus in Bologna, the rector Iacobus of the church of Saint Thomas del Mercato was called before the inquisition for confessing, absolving, and administering penance and last rites to Rosaflora, considered a relapsed heretic, seemingly so he could accord her a Christian burial. Moreover, even if the late Rosaflora had not relapsed into heresy, her disrespect for the inquisitors was in itself culpable. After her husband, Bonigrinus, was burned as a heretic, she had actually driven an inquisitor away from her door with curses and death threats.[207] When the mystic Marguerite Porete (d. 1310) was brought before the inquisitional tribunal, the mentally unstable cleric Guiard de Cressonessart attempted to intervene on her behalf. Guiard's infirmity was such that he believed he was the Angel of Philadelphia, possessed of a divine mission to protect others from ecclesiastical persecution.[208] In the south of France, a number of individuals who symto pathized with the heretical Spiritual Franciscans were themselves clerics, among them the rabble-rousing Bernard Délicieux.[209] Inquisitor Bernard Gui even provides a form for the sentencing and immuring of a religious who opposed the inquisition, which is seemingly based on a true case. It describes at length howa Dominican friar preached against the inquisition by impugning its processes as hyperbolic fictions, arguing that true Catholics were tortured and made to confess themselves heretics, appealing to the secular authorities to obstruct the inquisition's progress, and generally inciting the populace against the inquisitors. Obstinate throughout the trial, the intractable friar was at length condemned as a heretic. Although Bernard Délicieux eventually abjured his heresy and was absolved, he was nevertheless degraded and perpetually imprisoned. The fact that such a form merits inclusion in the manual suggests that the offense was by no means uncommon.[210]

That clerical intervention should be perceived as obstructionist to orthodoxy is but a sign of the times. In the early days of the inquisition, clerical opposition to Conrad of Marburg's methods and sympathy for his lay victims seem to have been heeded. Indeed, some of Conrad's highly placed clerical critics garnered the title of martyr for those who met with death in the course of his purge. Clerical intervention would also bring the contemporaneous inquisitor Robert le Bougre's reign of terror to an end. But the introduction of uniform procedures had the effect of not merely concealing inquisitorial excesses but even sanctioning the machinery itself. Nows uch clerically mounted resistance was regarded as heresy.[211]

If the resistance to the claims of an officially authorized saint could

precipitate charges of heresy, the same claims on behalf of an individual who was known to have been officially condemned were more dangerous still. It was clearly more than simple cheek that inspired the inhabitants of Albi to substitute portraits of neighbors recently condemned by the inquisition for the despised images of Dominic and Peter Martyr. But gestures that defiantly invert inquisitorial verdicts are exemplified in the early-fourteenth-century interrogations of the Beguins of Clermont-l'Hérault, Lod[egrave]ve, and Narbonne—"Beguin" in this context denoting the often lay supporters of the Spiritual Franciscans as opposed to the female movement of the Low Countries. [212] James Given has aptly labeled these trials "a contested performance," one in which inquisitorial action consistently gave rise to unintended effects. For instance, attendance at the general sermon for sentencing was customarily regarded as mandatory for all. This emphasis on compulsory attendance was sustained by the conviction that the various sentences would act as a deterrent to heretical error, a message powerfully reinforced by public executions. Yet these palpable displays of inquisitional power worked to the opposite effect, creating a newgeneration of martyrs.[213]

The central "heresy" that permeates the testimonies of these otherwise conventionally pious people is the conviction that the Spiritual Francis-cans and their supporters were unjustly put to death and were thus "saints and glorious martyrs." The following responses are typical. Manenta, wife of Bernardus Arnaud of Lod[egrave]ve, believed the Beguins to be saints on account of "the bitterness of the lives they endured."[214] Bernardus Malaura of Lod[egrave]ve claimed that he had "never seen people die so sweetly," that the deceased "were unjustly condemned and were saved and holy, and that in time it will be revealed that they are saints."[215] The priest Bernardus Pirotas twice officiated at a general office for martyrs on behalf of the deceased, offering a daytime and an evening service.[216]

Some of the accused went on to impugn the papacy, the Conventual Franciscans, or the inquisitors for their role in the condemnation of the innocent. The notary Bernardus Sabri, for instance, perceived the condemnation of the Beguins in the context of a greater eschatological upheaval. Their deaths signified that the life of Christ had been rejected sophistically (*sophistice*) by the city of Babylon, which was identified as the carnal church. The church would, in its turn, be destroyed by ten Saracen kings, an event that would anticipate the coming of Antichrist.[217] But the inquisitors did not need so flamboyant a narrative to understand the position of the Beguins, recognizing the string of errors attendant upon the invocation of the term "martyr." For if the laity, nurtured by Scripture and saints' lives,

cast the condemned heretics as martyrs, they were automatically associating the inquisitors themselves with the venal judges of Christ or of the early martyrs. Some of the witnesses were even prepared to make this connection explicit: thus Berengarius Jaoule of Lode` ve perceived the Beguins "who suffered patiently hitherto through the ministers of the Roman church in the likeness of Christ, who had suffered persecution through priests and ministers of the law."[218] Those who sympathized with the dead Beguins thus did what the pious Christians of the early church had done in similar circumstances, in keeping with the advocacy of clerics like James of Vitry and Thomas of Cantimpréon behalf of relics of the recent dead: the Beguins collected the remains of the tattered bodies of the deceased, which seem to have survived in profusion. 219 These remains were instantly accorded the same status as relics and were treated as such. For some, a relic would serve as a viaticum, carried around just as James of Vitry had carried the finger of his spiritual mother, Mary of Oignies. Thus Berengaria, a matron from Narbonne, carried a little bone "with reverence just as [one of] the relics of saints."[220] Galharda, wife to the eschatologically minded notary Bernardus, suppressed her occasional doubts about the status of the remains in her keeping and offered a conditional petition to the putative saint. Reverently touching the relics first to her mouth and then to each of her eyes, she prayed, " 'If you are the bones of saints, help me.' "[221]

Occasionally one can follow the reverent traffic in the relics of a specific individual, such as Esclarmonda Durban, who was burned at Lunel. The drama surrounding Esclarmonda's body is like an uncanny recasting of the tragedy of Antigone. In this medieval adaptation, however, it is two brothers from Clermont who are prepared to risk their lives to ensure a fitting disposition of their sister's body—a body that, as with the siblings of the Greek antecedent, was denied proper burial. The behavior of the two brothers reveals the way in which familial piety and the cult of relics could reinforce one another. Esclarmonda's brother Bernardus had been present when his sister was sentenced, and had been disturbed by certain irregularities. The press of people made it impossible for him to hear the charges made against her. But he was later told that when she asked to have her confession read back to her, as was standard procedure, this request was denied. As a result, Bernardus could not help but wonder whether Esclarmonda had received a fair trial. Bernardus was present at her execution and returned the following day, accompanied by his brother Raymondus and some others, to reclaim the largely intact body of Esclarmonda. Bernardus reverently placed some of his sister's remains in the wall of his house, keeping them, as he told the inquisitors, out

of love for her memory.[222]

Raymondus's account is more graphic. They broke Esclarmonda's body into pieces and placed it in a sack. One of his companions kept her heart, while Raymondus kept some of her flesh and bones concealed in a hole in his house. When asked about what he intended by this, Raymondus claims that he had hoped that, at some future point, Esclarmonda's name would be cleared: he believed that she and the others who were executed were good people who had suffered persecution unjustly. But now he had abandoned hope of any such rehabilitation. [223]

Bernardus and Raymondus relied on familial affection to justify their reverence for Esclarmonda before the inquisitors. But the testimony of others suggests that Esclarmonda had a particular reputation for holiness, and that her cult was by no means confined to the family circle. Martinus of Saint Antonius, an inhabitant of Clermont, is the individual to whom Esclarmonda's heart was entrusted. When he showed it to some other Beguins, they kissed the heart and signed it with a cross. His relic was clearly the object of some envy since another Beguin urged him to cut the heart down the middle to share it, but Martinus refused.[224] (The person in question was probably the priest Bernardus Pirotas, who admits that, having been shown a heart, he requested a portion.)[225] When asked by the inquisitors why Martinus distinguished Esclarmonda particularly, he replied that he was impressed by her perseverance and the good life she led, and that he had been told that her confession had not been read back to her, suggesting that she had been unjustly condemned.[226] Berangarius Rocha also claims to have seen someone kissing the heart of one of the Beguins who was executed, and it may well have been Esclarmonda's.[227]

Inquisitor Nicolas Eymeric alleged that the heretical Franciscans who spread the heresy of the Beguins were popular among "congregations of wretched little women [*muliercularum*]."[228] But clearly women were well represented not only as followers but also as objects of veneration. Other women besides Esclarmonda seem to have achieved cultic status. In fact, the cults surrounding the martyred Beguin women seem to have been especially active, existing on a natural continuum with the rise of female lay sanctity in the orthodox sphere. Among this particular set of testimonies, only women are distinguished for particular holiness. Jacoba Amorosia, a matron of Lod[egrave]ve, confessed that she had been given the nipple of a certain woman from among the deceased.[229] In a furtive visit to one of the sites of execution, Bernardus Malaura purposefully took the flesh of two women from his hometown of Lod[egrave]ve (one was called Mezina and the other went by the nickname La Levada) whom he

knew to have led particularly good lives.[230] Berengarius Jaoule's testimony also attests to the particular holiness of the women who were executed. Not only did he preserve the flesh of a certain unnamed woman, but he also alludes to the reputations for sanctity of two others: Astruga of Lod[egrave]ve and Amissat of Narbonne. Berengarius further alludes to rumors that the entire body of a woman had been taken from the execution site at Lunel—perhaps the body of Esclarmonda.[231]

The full extent of orthodoxy's role in producing antisaints was only partially acknowledged by the inquisitors themselves, perhaps because this realization was too disturbing to be fully integrated into their purview. This is suggested in the trial of the Beguin Petrus Dominici of Narbonne, a member of the Third Order Franciscans who was sentenced as a relapsed heretic by Bernard Gui in 1322. When captured for a second time, Petrus refused to renounce his heretical beliefs, proclaiming that the various Spiritual Franciscans and Beguins who were put to death by the inquisitors were martyrs. The individuals responsible for their deaths were heretics, including the pope, since he countenanced their error. Moreover, all the sacraments administered by this carnal lot were void.[232]

Only after two months of imprisonment would Petrus agree to renounce his many errors, which he proceeded to do, article by article, until he suddenly rallied—an occurrence that Gui describes as follows:

> After a little while, the aforesaid Petrus Dominici pretended that he was out of his mind [*confingens se alienatum a sensu*], praising the aforesaid sect and the heresy of the devious followers of that sect, whom he heard and knew were already condemned as heretics by church judgment. He knewand memorized their names and dared to record them in a litany that he wrote with his own hand among the holy martyrs and virgins and confessors in the style of the church, saying the litany—nowin a high voice, now in a lowone. And imploring many times the prayers of the damned men and their suffrages out of devotion to them for quite some time, he conceived, and held, and believed that their prayers would help him before God, just as he asserted by his own oath when arraigned in judgment. And that litany in which he wrote the names of the aforesaid damned individuals by hand, which numbered around seventy, he read out loud in the presence of the inquisitor.[233]

Clearly what we are witnessing does not resemble insanity so much as a courageous last stand. Facing certain death, Petrus was determined

to defy his carnal judges and die with the truth on his lips.[234] By describing this episode as feigned madness, Gui was either attempting to discredit heretical courage or, what is perhaps more likely, demonstrating his own incapability of recognizing a heroism so at odds with his own ideology that it could register only as a kind of madness.

At least on a theoretical level, Gui knewbetter . After all, one of the questions that his manual prompts the inquisitor to ask is whether the suspect "believed or now believes that the said Beguins, who were condemned as heretics, were and are Catholic and holy martyrs, suffering death to defend the truth. . . . Also whether he believed or now believes that those who condemned them as heretics themselves became heretics in so doing."[235] Beguins answered yes to both and died as a result. Their trials provide vivid testimony as to why the cults of the martyred inquisitors had so little chance of succeeding against so prolix and moving a competition. It was like an eerie return to the early church when the inquisitional procedure first revealed its potential for unintended effects—thwarting the pagan inquisitors by providing a platform for Christian heroism, the witnessing of which was said to have provoked many conversions. In the High and later Middle Ages, heretics would become saints and inquisitors would become heretics, once again realizing the inquisition's unnerving powers of reversal.

[1] William Pelhisson, *Chronique (1229–1244), Suivie de récit des troubles d'Albi*, ed. and trans. Jean Duvernoy (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1994), pp. 62–63. On the informality of episcopal inquiries, see Yves Dossat, "La répression de l'hérésie par les év ê ques," *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 6 (1971): 238–39.

[2] AndréVauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*, trans. Jean Birrell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 11–21.

[3] This is the general view. See Raoul Manselli, "De la 'persuasio' [agrave] la 'coercitio,' " *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 6 (1971): 176–77. R. I. Moore, however, presents persecution as imposed in a top-down way by the church, in *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Power and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987).

[4] Lateran IV, c. 8, 3, 62, Tanner, 1:237–39; 233–34, 263–64. See Vauchez, *Sainthood*, pp. 26–32.

[5] Lateran IV, c. 3, Tanner, 1:223–24. For an overview of the inquisition from Roman times to its introduction into the church in the thirteenth century, see Célestin Douais, *L'Inquisition: Ses origines—sa proc è dure* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1906), pp. 2–20. Manselli sees 1179–84 as the crucial years during which the church would assume a more coercive stance toward heretics ("De la 'persuasio' a` la 'coercitio,' " pp. 185–86). Peter Diehl situates the laity's attitudinal change in the first half of the thirteenth century, claiming that, with some exceptions, the inquisition was eventually supported by the laity, in "Overcoming Reluctance to Prosecute Heresy in Thirteenth-Century Italy," in *Christendom and Its Discontents: Exclusion, Persecution, and Rebellion, 1000–1500*, ed. Scott Waugh and Peter Diehl (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 47–66.

[6] Vauchez, *Sainthood*, pp. 36–40, 50.

[7] See chap. 1, pp. 25–27, and chap. 3, pp. 90–91, above.

[8] See especially the *Processus inquisitionis* of Narbonne (ca. 1249), the work of inquisitors Bernard of Caux and John of Saint Pierre and the first manual of its kind. It is translated in Walter Wakefield, *Heresy, Crusade, and Inquisition in Southern France, 1100–1250* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1974), app. 6, pp. 250–58. On its authorship, see Yves Dossat, "Le plus ancien manuel de l'inquisition méridionale: le *Processus inquisitionis (1248–1249*)," *Bulletin philologique et historique, du comite é des travaux historiques et scientifiques*, année 1948, pp. 33–37. Also see Antoine Dondaine, "Le manuel de l'inquisiteur (1230–1330)," *AFP* 17 (1947): 97–101. Note, however, that Dondaine assigns the manual to inquisitors William Raymond and Peter Durand since the sole manuscript begins with their letter of commission. Dondaine points out that the language and various stages outlined in this brief manual are those of a full-fledged inquisition—including a letter of commission, *modus citandi*, *formula interrogatorii*, etc. Moreover, the formularies included are real documents, retaining none of the theoretical or speculative aspects of Raymond of Peñafort's directory (pp. 98–99). For a general overview of the inquisition's organization and process, see Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:369–429. Two interesting recent works describe the inqui sition's exercise of power in Foucauldian terms. See John Arnold's *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Philadelpia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), and James Given's *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline, and Resistance in Languedoc* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1997).

[9] William of Puylaurens, *Chronique. Cronica Magistri Guillelmi de Podio Laurentii* ann. 1242, c. 41, ed. and trans. Jean Duvernoy (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1976), pp. 150–53. See Lorenzo Paolini, "Gli ordini mendicanti e l'inquisizione: il 'comportamento' degli eretici e il giudizio sui frati," *MEFRM* 89, 2 (1977): 695–709.

[10] See Bernard of Caux and John of Saint Pierre, *Processus inquisitionis*, p. 251; *Doctrina de modo procedendi contra haereticis*, in *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, ed. E. Mart[egrave]ne and U. Durand (Paris: Lutetia, 1717; reprint, New York: Burt Franklin, 1968), vol. 5, col. 1805. This manual, written before 1298, is basically a compilation of four fragments, including Raymond of Peñafort's compilation and Bernard of Caux and John of Saint Pierre's manual. See Dondaine, "Le manuel," pp. 108–11. Cf. Lorenzo Paolini's edition, *Il "De officio inquisitionis": La procedura inquisitoriale a Bologna e a Ferrara nel Trecento*, 2 vols. (Bologna: Editrice Universitaria Bolognina, 1976). This anonymous work was written between 1320 and 1325 in lower Lombardy and probably by a theologian, as opposed to a canonist. See Paolini's introduction, 1:vi–xiii; Dondaine, "Le manuel," pp. 117–21. *De officio inquisitionis* gives several different prescriptive versions of how the period of grace should be instituted (Paolini, *De officio inquisitionis*, 2:125–29; cf. 1:77–79). Also see Gui Foucois's *Quaestiones quindecim ad inquisitores*, printed in the appendix of Caesar Carena's *Tractatus de officio sanctissimae inquisitionis et modo procedendi in causis Fidei* (Cremona: Baptistam Belpierum, 1655), q. 2, p. 402. This short manual of the late thirteenth century was especially influential since the author became Pope Clement IV. It was used extensively in the anonymous *De officio inquisitionis* and in Gui's manual. Regarding the period of grace, Bernard Gui, writing ca. 1323, notes that there are some occasions when it would seem absurd (*Practica inquisitionis hereticae* 4.2.4, ed. Célestin Douais [Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1886], p. 185); see Dondaine, "Le manuel," pp. 115–21; for a summary of Gui's career, see Célestin Douais, *Documents pour servir [agrave] l'histoire de l'inquisition dans le Languedoc* (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1900), 1:cciii–ccvi. Book 5 of Gui's

manual has been translated in *WE*, pp. 375–445.

[11] See, for example, Paolini, *De officio inquisitionis*, pp. 16–17; cf. the discussion over the possibility that the bishop and inquisitors might question witnesses independently to expedite matters, in which case both tribunals were obliged to communicate with one another and agree about the sentencing, 2:135; also see 2:142. For the bishops' independent action against heresy in the Midi prior to the inquisition, see Dossat, "La répression," pp. 217–51. Dossat notes that once the inquisition was in place, it had a free hand in the persecution of heresy, especially in the matter of the death penalty, until the early fourteenth century when Clement V attempted to reimpose collaboration with the bishops (pp. 248–49; see Clem. 5.3.1.1). On Clement V's efforts and the resistance he encountered, see Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:335, 387, 453, 473, 2:96; on the inquisition's relations with the episcopacy, generally, see 1:330–36; also see below, pp. 137–38. Henry Ansgar Kelly argues that the bishop wielded more power than the inquisitor. This may be true with regard to the bishop's power over his diocese in a general sense but seems highly unlikely in the context of matters touching on heresy ("Inquisition and the Prosecution of Heresy: Misconceptions and Abuses," *Church History* 58 [1989]: 442).

[12] Foucois, *Quaestiones* q. 3, pp. 403–4. On this manual, see n. 10, above.

[13] See Marina Benedetti, ed., *Milano 1300: I processi inquisitoriali contro le devote e i devoti di santa Guglielma* (Milan: Libri Scheiwiller, 1999), p. 54 (hereafter *Processi . . . Guglielma*), where there is an explicit statement that the money will be used to defray inquisitorial expenses; pp. 62, 286 ff.

[14] Lea discusses the trouble that arose in one celebrated case when this formality was not observed (*Inquisition*, 1:376–77).

[15] VI.5.2.20; see Paolini, *De officio inquisitionis*, 2:121–22; also see Zanchino Ugolini, *Tractatus de haereticis*, in *Tractatus universi iuris*, ed. Camillo Campeggi (Venice: Franciscus Zilettus, 1584), vol. 11, pt. 2, c. 15, fols. 248v–49r. Ugolini was writing ca. 1330; see Dondaine, "Le manuel," p. 121. Also see Gui, *Practica* 3.1, p. 83; Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:387–90; Lorenzo Paolini, *L'Eresia a Bologna fra XIII e XIV secolo*, vol. 1, *L'Eresia catara alla fine del Duecento*, Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, Studi storici, fasc. 93 (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo), pp. 18–29; Célestin Douais, "La formule communicatio bonorum vivorum consilio des sentences inquisitoriales," *Le Moyen Age*, ser. 2,2, 12 (1898): 157–92. Many times, however, the counselors were the bishops or their delegates from the different dioceses that the inquisition affected (pp. 160–61); cf. idem, *L'Inquisition*, pp. 235–56.

[16] Gui, *Practica* 4.2.4, k, p. 207; cf. Paolini, *De officio inquisitionis*, 1:18–27, 30–32. For the cooperation between the church and the secular arm, see Richard Helmholz, *The Spirit of Classical Canon Law* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996), pp. 360–66.

[17] Gui, *Practica* 4.2.4, pp. 188–89, 193; also see Paolini, *De officio inquisitionis*, 1:30; cf. Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:377–78, 391. On the coercive use of such documents and the fear they generated, see Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society*, pp. 25–51; Arnold, *Inquisition and Power*, pp. 81–86; Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:379–80.

[18] On rumor, see Ugolini, *Tractatus* c. 11, p. 244v.

[19] See Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:401; Albert Shannon, "The Secrecy of Witnesses in Inquisitorial Tribunals and in Contemporary Secular Criminal Trials," in *Essays in Medieval Life and Thought*, ed. John Mundy et al. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), p. 60.

[20] Shannon, "Secrecy of Witnesses," pp. 61–63; R. C. Van Caenegem, "Methods of Proof in Western Medieval Law," *Mededelingen van Koninklijke*

Academie voor Wetenschappen Letteren en Schone Kunsten van Belgieï, Academiae Analecta 45, 3 (1983): 113.

[21] The content of their accusations should also be made known "lest the suppression of names lead to the bold bringing false charges" (Lateran IV, c. 8, Tanner, 1:238). See Paolini, *De officio inquisitionis*, for the various rationales given by councils, etc., for the suppression of names (2:122–23); cf. Ugolini, *Tractatus* c. 9, 6, fol. 240v.

[22] Gui, *Practica* 4.3.2, pp. 218–19; Paolini, *De officio inquisitionis*, 1:23, 2:66.

[23] Paolini, *De officio inquisitionis*, 1:113–14; Gui, *Practica* 4.2.4, pp. 198–99. On the pernicious role of familiars, informers, etc., see Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:381–82.

[24] Nicolas Eymeric's manual, written in 1376, provides one of the most detailed sections on torture. See *Directorium inquisitorium . . . denuo ex collatione plurium exemplorum emendatum, et accessione multarum literarum Apostolicarum* (Rome: In aedibus Pop. Rom., 1578), pt. 3, pp. 313–15; pt. 3, q. 61, pp. 372–73; on partial proof, see p. 373; see Dondaine "Le manuel," p. 124. Cf. Ugolini, *Tractatus* c. 9, fol. 240v.

[25] Eymeric, *Directorium* pt. 3, col. 314. On Eymeric, see the previous note.

[26] Ibid. pt. 3, q. 61, fol. 314.

[27] Innocent IV, *Commentaria: Apparatus in V libros Decretalium* X.5.41.6 (Frankfurt, 1570; reprint, Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1968), fol. 574r–v.

[28] Eymeric, *Directorium*, pt. 3, q. 61, p. 373; cf. Innocent IV, *Commentaria* X.5.41.5, fol. 574r.

[29] Gui, *Practica* 5.7.3, col. 295; *Doctrina de modo procendendi contra haereticos*, col. 1795.

[30] Paolini, *De officio inquisitionis*, 2:132.

[31] For an example, see inquisitor James Fournier's reorganization of Johannes Maurinus's confession into a series of articles (see Jean Duvernoy, ed., *Le Registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier, è vêque de Pamiers (1318–1325)* [Toulouse: E. Privat, 1965], 2:507–17). Similar lists of articles were recommended for the assembly of learned consultants. See n. 74, below.

[32] Sentencing is discussed pp. 139–40, below.

[33] Clem. 5.11.2; see, for example, Paolini, *De officio inquisitionis*, 2:137.

[34] Hostiensis, *Commentaria in secundum Decretalium librum* ad *de testibus et attestionibus* X.2.20.52; as cited by A. Mitri, *De figura juridica postularis in causis beatificationis et canonizationis* (Rome and Paris: Desclée, 1962), p. 41; cf. Aviad Kleinberg, who says that canonization is a trial resulting in a sentence rather than a philosophical inquiry, "Proving Sanctity: Selection and Authentication of Saints in the Later Middle Ages," *Viator* 20 (1989): 197. For an overview of processes of canonization, see Vauchez, *Sainthood*, pp. 40–48; Margaret Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse and the Process of Canonisation in the Fourteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1929), pp. 133–206.

[35] Goffred of Trani, *Summa super titulis Decretalium* X.3.45 (Lyon: Neudruck der Ausgabe, 1519), fol. 166r. Goffred's specificity is apparently unique for the thirteenth century (Kleinberg, "Proving Sanctity," p. 199). By the fourteenth century, authorities are more forthcoming. Thus the confessors' manual of Bartholomew of Pisa, written ca. 1338, repeats Goffred's criteria but interestingly substitutes "just" for "chaste." He also adds that the candidate must be humble and simple, and must sustain persecutions with charity, in *Summa de casibus consciencie secundum compilacionem Bartholomei de Pisis* ad *canonizacio*, Bodleian MS 736.

[36] X.45.1–2; see Kleinberg, "Proving Sanctity," p. 190.

[37] Hostiensis, *In tertium Decretalium librum commentaria* ad X.3.45.1 (Venice:

Iuntas, 1581), nos. 1–4, p. 172 (hereafter *Commentaria*). These risks are also central to Hostiensis's defense of the reservation of canonization to the papacy (nos. 7–10, p. 172a).

[38] Ibid., no. 4, fol. 172.

[39] Innocent IV, *Commentaria*, p. 457r; Hostiensis, *Commentaria* ad X.3.45.1, no. 10, p. 172a; Kleinberg, "Proving Sanctity," p. 197. Gaetani has the pope repeat this disclaimer twice during the public canonization (*Ordo Romanus* c. 15, ed. Dom. Mabillon, in *Museum Italicum* [Paris: Lutetia, 1689], 2:472, hereafter Mabillon). Gaetani's account is extant only in a fifteenth-century redaction. On this document, see Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse*, pp. 150–51. In another instance, however, Gaetani reports that the pope alludes to possible failure in the public consistory as well (*Die Zeremonienbuïcher der roïmischen Kurie im Mittelalter*, ed. Bernhard Schimmelpfennig [Tubingen: Max Niermeyer, 1973], p. 170, hereafter Schimmelpfennig). Gaetani is discussed below.

[40] Hostiensis, *Commentaria* ad X.3.45.1, no. 5, p. 172a. See p. 142, below.

[41] Ibid., no. 10, p. 172a. See p. 142, below.

[42] For Gaetani's writings, see n. 39, above. On Bridget's canonization, see the account ascribed to a certain Peter Amelius in n. 76, below. Ibid. ad X.3.45.1, no. 3, p. 172.

[43] Ibid. ad X.3.45.1, no. 5, p. 172.

[44] Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse*, pp. 154–56.

[45] Mabillon, c. 15, p. 418.

[46] Schimmelpfennig, no. 1, p. 167; Hostiensis also makes note of the fact that this order was not invariable: the martyr's case, for example, would be more automatic (Hostiensis, *Commentaria* ad X.3.45.1, no. 5, p. 172a). Philip the Fair's petition for this canonization was coercive: if denied, he threatened to have Clement's predecessor, the dubious Boniface VIII, denounced as a heretic.

[47] Cf. alternative designations—such as *prosecutor*, *promotor*, *sollicitator* (Mitri, *De figura juridica*, pp. 31, 34, 45; Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse*, pp. 157–59).

[48] See Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse*, pp. 164–69.

[49] Hostiensis, *Commentaria* ad X.3.45.1, no. 5, p. 172a; Gaetani, c. 15, p. 419.

[50] John's intense investment in Dorothea is linked to his own truncated career as a theologian. See Franz Hipler (as revised by Hans Westpfahl), "Johannes Marienwerder, der Beichtvater der seligen Dorothea von Montau," *Zeitschrift fuïr die Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ermlands* 29, 1 (1956): 6–14, 27–32. On Dorothea and John, see Dyan Elliott, "Authorizing a Life: The Collaboration of Dorothea of Montau and John Marienwerder," in *Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and Their Interpreters*, ed. Catherine

Mooney (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), pp. 168–91. On Dorothea's spirituality, see Richard Kieckhefer, *Unquiet Souls: Fourteenth-Century Saints and Their Religious Milieu* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), esp. pp. 22–33.

[51] John of Marienwerder, *Vita Dorotheae Montoviensis Magistri Johannis Marienwerder* 7.25.f, ed. Hans Westpfahl, Forschungen und Quellen zur Kirchen- und Kulturgeschichte Ostdeutschlands, vol. 1 (Cologne and Graz: Boïhlau, 1964), p. 364; *Vita Lindana* chap. 87, *AASS*, October, 13:557. Conrad of Marburg likewise preached the pivotal sermon on Elisabeth of Hungary's virtues that was preliminary to inviting witnesses to come forward. See chap. 3, n. 23, above.

[52] See Stachnik's introductory remarks to the third set of articles in *Die Akten des Kanonisations-prozesses Dorotheas von Montau von 1394 bis 1521*, ed. Richard

Stachnik (Cologne and Vienna: Boïhlau, 1978), p. 18.

[53] See the testimony of the scribe Cristanus Coslaw, in Stachnik, *Akten des Kanonisationsprozesses*, pp. 241–44, esp. p. 243. Coslaw's miracle book is included in the process after his testimony (pp. 244–50).

[54] In his testimony, John mentions the scribes by name, along with the fact that they publish the miracles daily in the church (Stachnik, *Akten des Kanonisationsprozesses*, III, ad 20, p. 283).

[55] Antoninus of Florence would caution explicitly against revealing a saint's merits (*Confessionale Anthonini* 3.29 [Paris: Jehan Petit, 1507?], fol. 38v). He even argues against the revelation of a special grace heard in confession (the example he gives, interestingly, concerns a virgin who had never committed a mortal sin), since other penitents might suffer by comparison. Note that eventually with the publication of the *Codex* (the code of canon law presently in use), an individual saint's confessor will be excluded as a witness to his penitent's sanctity. See Mitri, *De figura juridica*, pp. 101–2 n. 41. Dorothea's vernacular confessions were appended to the conclusion of the *Septililium*. These have been edited by Franz Hipler as "Die Beichten der seligen Dorothea von Montau," *Zeitschrift fuïr die Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ermlands* 6 (1877): 147–83.

[56] Vauchez, *Sainthood*, p. 50 n. 70.

[57] On notaries and legal forms, see Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse*, pp. 187–88.

[58] Gui, *Practica* bk. 5, prologue, p. 236; cf. the treatise by the Franciscan David of Augsburg (d. 1271) *Tractatus de haeresi* E. Mart[egrave]ne and U. Durand (Paris: Lutetia, 1717; reprint, New York: Burt Franklin, 1968), vol. 5, col. 1791. See Dondaine, "Le manuale," pp. 104–5.

[59] Mabillon, pp. 419–20; cf. Schimmelpfennig, p. 168; Hostiensis, *Commentaria* ad X.3.45.1, no. 5, p. 172a.

[60] Louis Carolus-Barré, ed., "Consultation du Cardinal Pietro Colonna sur le IIe miracle de Saint Louis," *Biblioth[egrave]que de l'Ecole des Chartes* 117 (1959): 57–72. Kleinberg analyzes this proof in "Proving Sanctity," pp. 201–2.

[61] This document has been edited by Vauchez in the appendix of his *Sainthood*, pp. 540–58. While Vauchez posits that this analysis was the summary read before the consistory, Kleinberg argues that this was an introduction to the miracles ("Proving Sanctity," pp. 203–5). On the rise of medical expertise and scientific reasoning in assessing miracles, see Francis Antonelli, *De inquisitione medicolegali super miraculis in causis beatificationis et canonizationis* (Rome: Pontificium Athenaeum Antonianum, 1962), pp. 22–30. Antonelli notes that at the time of the inquest, recipients of miracles are also enjoined to be examined by a doctor (p. 25). Also see Gaetani's short account of the consistory's discussion of miracles with respect to Thomas of Cantilupe (Schimmelpfennig, no. 3, p. 164).

[62] Bollandists, ed., "Proc[egrave]s-verbal du dernier consistoire secret préparatoire [agrave] la canonisation," in "S. Pierre Célestin et ses premiers biographes," *AB* 16 (1897): 475–87.

[63] Schimmelpfennig, p. 168.

[64] Gaetani reports that Clement's attestation occurred at the Council of Vienne (1311). The final consistory occurred after the return to Avignon (ibid., p. 168).

[65] Bollandists, "Proc[egrave]s-verbal," p. 475; see Schimmelpfennig, p. 168.

[66] Bollandists, "Proc[egrave]s-verbal," p. 476.

[67] See the second miracle before the accession to the papacy, ibid., pp. 478–79, 479 n. 1.

[68] Schimmelpfennig, p. 168; cf. his directives on the secret consistory (Mabillon, pp. 419–20).

[69] Bollandists, "Proc[egrave]s-verbal," p. 477 and n. 1.

[70] Mitri, *De figura juridica*, pp. 46–47.

[71] Hostiensis, *Commentaria* ad X.3.45.1, nos. 7–10, p. 172a; cf. Innocent IV, *Commentaria* X.3.45.1, no. 3, fol. 457r.

[72] This occurs at the dress rehearsal for the public consistory and the public consistory itself, discussed below (Schimmelpfennig, pp. 169, 170). Indeed, in the case of Thomas of Cantilupe, papal prerogative receives even greater emphasis since John XXII dramatically postponed his response to the cardinals' supplication until the next day (ibid., p. 166).

[73] Mandatory collaboration with the episcopacy needed constant reiteration. See, for example, the papal commission of 1306 authorizing two Franciscan friars as inquisitors, but threatening them with suspension if they operated without the cooperation of the bishop (see Douais, *Documents pour servir l'inquisition*, 2:311). Also see the Clementine reforms and resistance, discussed above. With regard to the Guglielmites, no mention is made of the episcopal authority in the inquisitors' preamble to the trials. Though the one remaining sentence is given at the bishop's palace in the presence of the learned, it is nevertheless clear that the trials were conducted by the inquisitors alone (*Processi . . . Guglielma*, pp. 52, 202–4; cf. Lea, *Inquisition*, 3:101).

[74] The learned do make recommendations: for instance, they suggest that torture be applied to Julianus Saglimbene (bursarius), and if he still does not confess, that he be executed as a relapsed heretic (*Acta S. Officii Bononie: ab anno 1291 usque ad annum 1310*, ed. Lorenzo Paolini and Raniero Orioli, Fonti per le storia d'Italia, no. 106 [Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, 1982–84]: 2:600–601). But such opinions probably ratified the inquisitors' views. Paolini considers that the counselors' advice was limited to juridical and procedural matters, not restraining the actions of the inquisitors yet providing a safeguard (*L'Eresia a Bologna*, 1:28–29). Gui requires that a summary be made of each individual's faults, with extracts of their testimony, for the consideration of these authorities (Gui, *Practica* 3.1, p. 83). But Lea argues that this seldom occurred since the necessary brevity of such an assembly was unequal to the immense number of cases (*Inquisition*, 1:387–90). Douais takes a more optimistic view of their function, though his examples tend to ratify the inquisitors' judgments ("La formule communicatio," p. 159).

[75] Schimmelpfennig, p. 169; Mabillon, pp. 421–22. Gaetani does not mention the procurator in the case of Peter of Morrone.

[76] In addition to the cardinals' genuflection, the pope also had the various dignitaries and cardinals kiss his foot and hand when they made their respective offerings (Peter Amelius, in *Ordo Romanus*, *Museum Italicum* c. 153, 2:536).

[77] Mabillon, pp. 422–24; Schimmelpfennig, p. 173. Gaetani concludes with the revelation that he himself was the cardinal deacon who administered to the pope on his right side during this ceremony.

[78] Amelius, in *Ordo Romanus*, *Museum Italicum* c. 153, 2:536.

[79] Gui, *Practica* 3.1, pp. 83–84. Secular officials are also sworn in at the beginning of this stage of the proceedings, clearly indicating, to Gui's mind, a movement toward the secular arm's punitive function. Regarding sentencing, also see Paolini, *De officio inquisitionis*, 2:138–43, and *Doctrina de modo procedendi contra hereticos*, col. 1796. Cf. Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:391–93.

[80] Gui, *Practica* 3.1, pp. 84–86. Note that the person who has never confessed has already been subjected to a three-year imprisonment (ibid. 5.7.13, p. 302). The Council of Narbonne of 1243 had ruled that the unconfessed could be incriminated by witnesses alone (Mansi, vol. 23, col. 363,

c. 26).

[81] Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Sermo de translacione beate Elyzabeth*, in "Des Cäsarius von Heisterbach Schriften über die hl. Elisabeth von Thüringen," ed. Albert Huyskens, *Annalen des historischen Vereins fuïr den Niederrhein* 86 (1908): 56–57. The anonymous life of Elisabeth asserts that Frederick, along with his heir Conrad, came straight from his victory over his seditious son, Henry (see Diodorus Henniges, ed., "Vita S. Elisabeth, Langraviae Thuringiae," *AFH* 2 [1909]: 267). Also see David Abulafia, *Frederick II: A Medieval Emperor* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 247–48.

[82] Albert Huyskens, ed., *Der sog. Libellus de dictis quatuor ancillarum s. Elisabeth confectus* (Kempten and Munich: Jos. Koïsel'schen, 1911), pp. 82–83. The section regarding the translation is a later addition to the original text.

[83] Pelhisson, *Chronique* ann. 1231, pp. 42–45 (bis); ann. 1234, pp. 56–57; ann. 1235, pp. 68–69; ann. 1236, pp. 96–97, 98–99, 108–9. On sentences against the dead, see Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society*, p. 75; Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:448–49, 553.

[84] Henry of Langenstein, *Secreta sacerdotum magistri Henrici de Hassia. Que sibi placent vel displicent in missa* (Augsburg: Johannes Froschauer, 1503), ad incipit *Etiam tacere nequeo* (no pagination or chapter numbers).

[85] Aquinas, quodlib. 9, q. 8, *Opera omnia: Quaestiones de quolibet*, ed. Ordo Fratrum Praedicatorum (Rome: Commissio Leonina, 1996), 25,1:118.

[86] William of Puylaurens, *Chronique* ann. 1246–47, c. 45, pp. 180–81.

[87] The bull commissioning the inquest also refers to some kind of preliminary examination already undertaken by the pope's appointee, the bishop of Lode`ve. It is printed in Cl. Devic et J. Vaiss[egrave]te, *Histoire g è n è rale de Languedoc* (Toulouse: Privat, 1879), no. 403, 8:1236–38 (see esp. 1236–37). Also see ibid., no. 37, 7:108–10. The inquest took place on 12–24 July. William of Puylaurens assisted. The count designated Raimond d'Alfara as his procurator in his absence, an unfortunate choice since this person, bastard son of Raymond V, had been involved in the murder of the inquisitors of Avignonet. The last procurator may well have been William of Puylaurens himself. See Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:188–89.

[88] Raymond had already negotiated with the then king, Philip Augustus, to have the penalty of disinheritance lifted; this was conceded to him but not to his heirs (William of Puylaurens, *Chronique* ann. 1228–29, c. 37, pp. 134–35; Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:188). Raymond VI's skull was still on display at the end of the seventeenth century (ibid., 1:189). For the canonistic sanctions surrounding the Christian burial of excommunicates, heretics, and those attempting to secure a burial for a known heretic or sympathizer, see Antoine Bernard, *La S è pulture en droit canonique* (Paris: Editions DomanMontcrestien, 1933), pp. 125–32. In addition to the devastating financial blow, there was considerable stigma attached to having the body of a relative exhumed and burned. See, for example, the testimony of the Bolognese Bompetrus who concealed the fact that his father had received the *consolamentum* for shame lest they burn his bones (Paolini and Orioli, *Acta*, 1:44). On the outrage inspired by such burnings, see n. 204, below.

[89] Other parallels with the Virgin include the fact that both their mothers had three husbands, Joseph's and Ser Benedetto's both being much older than their wives, the ease with which each husband consented to chastity, the similarity of stature and complexion of the two woman, etc. (Peter of Luca, *Narrativa della Vite, e Morte della Beata Elena Duglioli dall'Oglio*, MS Gozzadini, 292, Bibliotheca Archiganasio, Bologna, fols. 4v, 6r–v, 11v–12r). The life is an avowed appeal for her canonization. It opens with a summary of her virtues

and the miracles worked upon her and through her, clearly a preliminary effort to draw up a set of articles of interrogation. Elena's will of 14 April 1517 has also been preserved. It discusses her past endowment of a chapel for the group of canons regular to which Peter belonged and bequeaths her house to them after her death (*Testamento della Beata Elena figlia del quidem ser Siverio da duglido cittadino, e tesaro di Bologna, vedova e moglie del gi[agrave] ser' Benedetto dall'Olio cittadino pure, et nat. di Bologna*, B. 374, Bibliotheca Archiganasio, Bologna). On the sources for Elena's life, see Giovambattista Melloni, *Atti o memorie degli uomini illustri in santit[agrave] nati, o morti in Bologna* (Bolo-Lelio della volpe, 1773), 3:301–5. Also see Gabrielle Zarri, *Le sante vive: cultura e religiosita` femminile nella prima eta` moderna* (Turin: Rosenberg and Sellier, 1990), pp. 165–96.

90 Peter of Luca, *Narrativa*, fols. 4r, 11r.

91 Ibid., fol. 4r. On the dismemberment of holy bodies, see chap. 2, pp. 71–72, above.

92 Ibid., fol. 5r.

93 Ibid., fol. 15r; cf. 3r. Also see Peter's second treatise in the manuscript, which deals exclusively with Elena's heart, the manner in which it was exchanged, and the meaning, *Del Cuore S. Helena vergine*, fols. 21r–24v. Further mention of a doctor was made when milk miraculously poured from her breasts after her death (fol. 13v).

94 Peter of Luca, *Narrativa*, fols. 5v, 14r–v.

95 Ibid., fol. 5v.

96 Ibid., fols. 13r, 5v; idem, *Del Cuore*, fol. 23v.

97 Peter of Luca, *Narrativa*, fols. 3r, 13v–14r. Note that Peter perceives Elena's milk as an apocalyptic sign (fol. 4r).

98 On the chapel, see ibid., fol. 3r; idem, *Del Cuore*, fol. 24v; Zarri, *Le sante vive*, pp. 181–82. Her special affinity with Cecilia was due to her spiritual marriage (ibid., pp. 171, 174, 175). On Cecilia as the paradigm of chaste unions, see Dyan Elliott, *Spiritual Marriage: Sexual Abstinence in Medieval Wedlock* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993), pp. 64–65, 208–9.

99 Leandro Alberti, *Historie de Bologna divise in cinque Deche (1253–1543)* ann. 1520, vol. 4, fol. 155v (359 of the continuous numbering), Biblioteca Universitaria da Bologna, MS ital. 204 (97). Alberti was the Dominican doctor in question. See Zarri, *Le sante vive*, pp. 183–84.

100 For detailed testimonies, see Enrico Menesto`, ed., *Il processo di canonizzazione di Chiara da Montefalco* (Regione dell'Umbria: La Nuova Italia, 1984), Sr. Johanna, witness 1, ad art. 159, pp. 85–87; Sr. Marina, witness 38, ad art. 159, pp. 153–54; Sr. Francescha, witness 67, ad art. 159, p. 339. (This is a different Francescha from the nun who performed the surgery, the latter being dead at the time of the inquest.) Katherine Park situates Clare's case in the wider context of the rise of autopsies in "The Criminal and Saintly Body: Autopsy and Dissection in Renaissance Italy," *Renaissance Quarterly* 47 (1994): 1–33; also see Marie-Christine Pouchelle, *The Body and Surgery in the Middle Ages*, trans. Rosemary Morris (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1990), pp. 83–86. Cf. Margaret of Citt[agrave]di Castello (d. 1320) in whose heart were discovered three little globes, each possessed of a diminutive image of a member of the holy family, along with Margaret herself—depicted as kneeling in front of Joseph. Margaret had claimed to bear a treasure in her heart. See "Vita beatae Margaritae virginis de civitate Castelli" c. 8, ed. A. Poncelet, *AB* 19 (1900): 27–28. Margaret of Faenza (d. 1330) also experienced the wounds of the passionduring her lifetime (see Petrus Florentinus's contemporary life, *AA SS*, May, 5:849). Later accounts suggest that these

wounds were visible after her death (see Gian Domenico Gordini's entry in *BS*, 8:774). *BS*

[101] Menesto`, *Il processo*, intro., pp. XXVII–XXXII.

[102] The line of questioning pursued by the examiners corresponds to the progressive pathologization of female spirituality, discussed in the section entitled "Disintegrating Proof" of chap. 5, below.

[103] *Processus*, Clare of Montefalco, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Riti, Proc. 676. This document is dated 22 August 1308.

[104] Menesto`, *Il processo*, Sr. Johanna, witness no. 1, ad art. 162, pp. 88, 90; Sr. Thomassa, witness 39, ad art. 142, p. 249; Sr. Francescha, witness 67, ad 162, p. 341; *Processus*, Clare of Montefalco, Proc. 676.

[105] Menesto`, *Il processo*, pp. 434–36. Thomas's testimony did not, however, stand up very well to cross-examination: his view that the signs were false was based solely on the chaplain's antipathy to worship of the cross; he did not know the extent of Clare's acquaintance with the evil clerics in question; and he admitted that she was unaware of their reputation. He was also not sure whether Clare's falling proceeded from a good or bad spirit.

[106] On Dorothea's wounds, see *Vita latina* 2.24, pp. 86–87; *Vita Lindana* chap. 17, *AASS*, October, 13:508; and Kieckhefer, *Unquiet Souls*, p. 27. Her canonization is discussed in greater detail in Elliott, "Authorizing a Life," pp. 185–90.

[107] The two Johns examined Dorothea together after her arrival in Marienwerder. This examination is described in *Vita Lindana* chap. 56, in *AA SS*, October, 13:530 (according to the original numbering, which appears in the margins). The later *Vita latina*, moreover, makes it clear that she was examined at the beginning of her relationship with John as well as before her enclosure as an anchoress (3.28.e, g, pp. 150, 151). Cf. III, article 18 in the process of canonizaton (Stachnik, *Akten des Kanonisationsprozesses*, pp. 21–22). It seems probable that the two Johns submitted their findings to the bishop, John Moïnch—a conjecture based on the fact that he then seems to have conducted his own, somewhat informal, examination of Dorothea (see *Akten des Kanonisationsprozesses*, III, ad 5, p. 413; III, ad 22, p. 417; III, ad 26, p. 418). Also Christ mystically sent her before Moïnch, after he had told Dorothea that he wanted a vision revealed to him (*Liber de festis Magistri Johannis Marienwerder offenbarungen der Dorothea von Montau* c. 92, ed. Anne-liese Triller, Forschungen und Quellen zur Kirchen-und Kulturgeschichte Ostdeutschlands, vol.

25 [Cologne: Boïhlau, 1992], p. 159).

[108] On her background and her arrival in Marienwerder, see Hipler, "Johannes Marienwerder," pp. 36–42. For Dorothea's pre-Marienwerder days, see Hans Westpfahl, "Beiträge zur Dorotheenforschung," *Zeitschrift fuïr die Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ermlands* 27 (1939): 122–74.

[109] See Anneliese Triller, "Häresien in Altpreussen um 1390?" in *Studien zur Geschichte des Preussenlandes: Festschrift fuïr Erich Keyser zu seinem 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden und Schuïlern*, ed. Ernst Bahr (Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1963), pp. 400–401.

[110] Stachnik, *Akten des Kanonisationsprozesses*, III, ad 20, p. 84. Dorothea would occasionally confess to the priest Ludike, who denounced her for excessive piety, but especially for the unusual things she said in confession, probably concerning her mystical experiences (ibid., III, ad 11, 20, pp. 107, 108). Inquisitors would sometimes summon people for suspicions over the unusual content of their visions. The Bolognese friar Avantius claims he received a penitential cross from the inquisition for visions and dreams (*visiones*

et sompnia) alone, nothing else (Paolini and Orioli, *Acta*, p. 71).

111 John refers to the necessity of going on pilgrimages to ensure Dorothea's safety and of how she was vilified for her spiritual gifts (*Vita latina* 3.9.a, 3.26.b, pp. 123, 147; *Vita Lindana*, *AA SS*, October, c. 41, c. 55, 13:520, 529).

112 For Clare's process, see Menesto`'s introduction, *Il processo*, pp. XXVIII–XLV. The initial efforts were seemingly abandoned at the curial stage for unknown reasons (p. XXXVII). For Dorothea's canonization, see Ute Stargardt, "The Political and Social Backgrounds of the Canonization of Dorothea von Montau," *Mystics Quarterly* 11 (1985): 107–222.

113 On popular and local sainthood, see Vauchez, *Sainthood*, pp. 147–56. Also see the case study "Anti-Semitism and Popular Culture: The Cult of St. Werner," in idem, *The Laity in the Middle Ages: Religious Beliefs and Devotional Practices*, trans. Margery Schneider (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993), pp. 141–52. On the concurrence of these heresies, see Stephen Wessley's dissertation, "Enthusiasm and Heresy in the Year 1300: Guglielma of Milan, Armanno Pungilupo of Ferrara and Gerard Segarelli" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1976). Wessley argues that the condemnation of this set of heresies resulted from a coalition between the mendicants and the papacy. Cf. Franciscan chronicler Salimbene's own assessment of the contestation over Armannus in n. 151, below.

114 Armannus's case is preserved in the summary of the papal investigation, edited by Gabriele Zanella in the appendixes of *Itinerari ereticali: patari e catari tra Rimini e Verona*, Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, Studi storici, fasc. 153 (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, 1986). Aviad Kleinberg discusses Armannus in terms of the contrast between the vox populi and papal canonization. See *Prophets in Their Own Country: Living Saints and the Making of Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 37–39. Also see his examination of the case of Marcolinus of Forli (d. 1397), pp. 31–37. Cf. Carol Lansing's *Power and Purity: Cathar Heresy in Medieval Italy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 92–95; Mariano d'Alatri, "Culto de santi ed eretici in Italia nei secoli XII e XIII," *Collectanea Franciscana* 45 (1975): 100–101; idem, "L'eresia nella Cronica di Fra Salimbene," *Collectanea Franciscana* 37 (1967): 366–73; Zanella, *Itinerari ereticali*, introd., pp. 16–29; Lea, *Inquisition*, 2:240–42. On mendicant hostility to Armannus's cult, see Wessley, "Enthusiasm and Heresy," pp. 209 ff. Armannus also allegedly hated the mendicant orders, particularly the Dominicans, whom he referred to as rapacious wolves (ibid., p. 210). Salimbene alleges that there were several cases similar to that of Armannus in other towns (Salimbene, *Chronicle*, p. 514 [736]). See Michael Goodich, "The Politics of Canonization in the Thirteenth Century: Lay and Mendicant Saints," in *Saints and Their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore and History*, ed. Stephen Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 174–75.

115 Zanella, *Itinerari ereticali*, app. 1, pp. 70–85.

116 Ibid., pp. 84–89.

117 For the document repealing the interdict, see ibid., app. 2, pp. 104–7. For the inquisitors'case against Armannus, see app. 1, pp. 48–70.

118 Lansing, *Power and Purity*, p. 93.

119 Zanella, *Itinerari ereticali*, app. 1, p. 90.

120 Bollandists, "Proce`sverbal," p. 476.

121 The papal inquiry reports that the inquisitor's case against Armannus was opened in 1285. This must be the formal date, since some of the testimonies are from as early as 1270 (Zanella, *Itinerari ereticali*, app. 1, p. 48). Thomas of Cantimprérelates a similar episode in Antwerp concerning a certain William

Cornelius, an ascetical preacher of poverty who was buried in honor but eventually disinterred and burned as a heretic (*De apibus* 2.47.3, pp. 432–33).

122 Wessley, "Enthusiasm and Heresy," pp. 203–4. This was the position taken by fifteenth-century Pellegrino Prisciano.

123 Zanella, *Itinerari ereticali*, app. 1, p. 70.

124 For an overview of Guglielma and the Guglielmites, see Stephen Wessley, "The Thirteenth-Century Guglielmites: Salvation through Women," in *Medieval Women*, ed. Derek Baker, Studies in Church History, subs. ser., vol. 1 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1978), pp. 289–303, and Luisa Muraro's *Guglielma e Maifreda: Storia di un'eresia femminista* (Milan: Tartaruga, 1985). Barbara Newman's remarkable study "WomanSpirit,Woman Pope" places the Guglielmites in the wider historical context of representations of the female aspect of the Trinity, in *From Virile Woman to WomanChrist: Studies in Medieval Religion and Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995), pp. 183–223, esp. pp. 185–95. Guglielma's desire to be buried at the monastery and her bequest are mentioned in various testimonies (see, for example, the comments of Sibilia, widow of Beltramus Malcozati, *Processi . . . Guglielma*, 2:353). The political difficulties at the time of her death are alluded to in the testimony of Andreas Saramita, ibid., p. 170. The body was duly translated in October, an event discussed below.

125 On the relationship between the Humiliatae house of Biassono and the Guglielmites, see Wessley, "The Guglielmites," pp. 298–99.

126 *Processi . . . Guglielma*, Mayfreda de Pirovano, Humiliata, p. 98. This particular testimony also summarizes the Gugliemite contentions, including Mayfreda's role in the faith. On the impact of Joachim of Fiore's vision of history, see Marjorie Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969). Regarding Joachim's personal views, see E. Randolph Daniel, "Exodus and Exile: Joachim of Fiore's Apocalyptic Scenario," in *Last Things: Death and the Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. CarolineWalker Bynum and Paul Freedman (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), pp. 124–39.

127 On their beliefs and organizational structure, see Newman, *From Virile Woman*, pp. 188–89, 193–94; Wessley, "The Guglielmites," pp. 294–301; Muraro, *Guglielma e Maifreda*, pp. 113–51.

128 The only remaining sentence is for the relapsed heretic Humiliata Jacoba de Bassanis de Nova, who was handed over to the secular arm for execution (*Processi . . . Guglielma*, pp. 202–4).

129 Ibid., Ricadona Saramita, pp. 222–24. Even had Andreas not been condemned, the family's property was still at risk since he eventually confessed that his mother and his sister had continued to believe in Guglielma after their abjuration to the inquisition (pp. 174–76; cf. p. 56). The penitential crosses come to the fore because of appeals to put them aside in return for payment of a fine (see pp. 282 ff.).

130 Ibid., Andreas, p. 58.

131 Ibid., pp. 56–58.

132 Ibid., p. 58; Myranus, chaplain of Saint Firmus, p. 70. In fact, Myranus had served as secretary to Mayfreda and Andreas and was far from orthodox.

133 Ibid., Sibilia, p. 84; Girardus de Novazano, Third Order Franciscan, pp. 92, 268. On her deathbed, Guglielma attributed the invisibility of her stigmata to her followers' incredulity (Andreas, p. 170)—a view paralleling orthodox explanations for the failed cults of martyred inquisitors. See chap. 2, p. 61, above. Catherine of Siena's stigmata were also invisible, but at her own request. See Karen Scott, "Mystical Death, Bodily Death: Catherine of Siena and

Raymond of Capua on the Mystic's Encounter with God," in *Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and Their Interpreters*, ed. Catherine Mooney (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), p. 164.

134 *Processi . . . Guglielma*, Andreas, p. 58; Sibilia, p. 84.

135 Ibid., Alegrantia, wife of Johannes of Perugia, p. 226. On the significance of this dinner, see Muraro, *Guglielma e Maifreda*, pp. 153–64.

136 *Processi . . . Guglielma*, Myranus of Saint Firmus, p. 76.

137 Ibid., Felix, widow of Francinus de Casate, p. 90; Girardus, pp. 92, 268; Flordebellina, daughter of Andreas Saramita, p. 106; Sibilia, p. 84. Bellacara, wife of Bonadeus Karentani, mistakenly places the translation on All Saints' Day, i.e., 1 November (p. 65).

138 Ibid., Andreas, p. 172; Girardus, pp. 92, 268. Andreas and Mayfreda believed that the angel Raphael had announced Guglielma's birth to Constance, queen of Bohemia, just as Gabriel had foretold the birth of Christ to Mary (Andreas, p. 172).

139 Ibid., Girardus, p. 96. More ambitiously, Andreas also rewrote the New Testament (Mayfreda, p. 100; cf. Andreas, p. 174).

140 Ibid., Mayfreda, pp. 78, 194; cf. Jacobus, 66. For a discussion of Mayfreda's ritual role, see Newman, *From Virile Woman*, pp. 191–93.

141 *Processi . . . Guglielma*, Francischus, cleric, son of Gasparrus de Garbagniate, p. 256.

142 Ibid., Flordebellina, p. 108; Agnes, Humiliata, daughter of Cabrius Montenarius, p. 110; Jacoba de Nova, Humilita, p. 116; Franceschinus, son of Beltramus Malcolzati, p. 132; Petra de Alzate and Katella de Gioziis, p. 120; Dionese, wife of Jacobus de Novate, p. 210; Stephanus, pp. 234–63; Carabella, widow of Amizonus Toscanus, p. 246; Francischus, p. 254.

143 Bellacara and Stephanus de Crimella both seem to associate the ceremonial garb with the impending canonization (ibid., pp. 64, 234–36), while others were convinced that it was for the resurrection (Girardus, pp. 72, 92, 96–98, 268; cf. Flordebellina, p. 108). When interrogated on these matters, Myranus of Saint Firmus stipulates that Guglielma would rise from the dead in the presence of her followers (p. 74; cf. p. 72).

144 Cf. Newman, *From Virile Woman*, p. 191.

145 *Processi . . . Guglielma*, Myranus of Saint Firmus, p. 74; Bellacara, p. 64; Mayfreda, p. 80; Flordebellina, p. 106; Agnes, p. 110; Jacoba, p. 114; Petra and Katella, p. 118; Franceschinus, p. 142; Sibilia, p. 156; Ottorinus, son of Gasparrus de Garbagniate, p. 165. Sibilia reports that when she was suffering from a fever, Mayfreda sent her three such hosts (p. 84).

146 Andreas later bought the monk a new scapular (ibid., Myranus of Saint Firmus, p. 180). Regarding the water, also see Mayfreda, p. 80; Flordebellina, p. 106.

147 Ibid., Myranus of Saint Firmus, p. 74.

148 Ibid., Stephanus, p. 236; Danisius, p. 240. But despite these seemingly licit venues, the sectarians also camouflaged some of their devotions, labeling depictions of Guglielma as Saint Catherine (Myranus of Saint Firmus, p. 72). The sectarians also, of course, had their own private images (Stephanus, p. 272).

149 Ibid., Alegrantia, p. 136; Andreas, p. 144; Bellacara, p. 146; Stephana, wife of Filixinus Karentanus, pp. 148–50; Taria, daughter of the late Johannes Pontarius, p. 152; Petra, wife of Myranus de Garbagniate, p. 160; Bonadeus, son of the late Anselmus Karentanus, p. 184; Johanna, daughter of Bonadeus Karentanus, p. 188; Jacoba, p. 190; Girardus, pp. 268, 270.

150 Lea, *Inquisition*, 3:102.

151 "Here are many reasons for the devotion to this Albert: because the infirm wished to regain their health, because the curious merely wanted to see novelties, because the clerks had envy toward the modern religious Orders, and because the bishops and canons wished to gain money," Salimbene, *The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*, trans. Joseph Baird et al. (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1986), p. 514 [736]. Also see n. 113, above.

152 Newman, *From Virile Woman*, pp. 189–90.

153 The designation of "brothers" could be interpreted as signifying the Dominican inquisitors, although they are almost invariably referred to as *inquisitores* throughout the record. The fact that these events were ostensibly staged in the Cistercian abbey would seem to make the monks themselves more likely candidates.

154 *Processi . . . Guglielma*, Girardus, p. 96.

155 Marchixius, son of the late Demianus Sichi, is already arguing that the monks bought Guglielma's house for her, presumably in an attempt to forestall its seizure or destruction. The register identifies this witness simply as living in the monastery; thus Lea assumes he is a monk. But his personal ownership of property suggests a lay status (*Processi . . . Guglielma*, p. 304; see Lea, *Inquisition*, 3:102).

156 See Lea, *Inquisition*, 3:91–92; Newman is also inclined to see Guglielma as orthodox, though she entertains the other possibility as well (*From Virile Woman*, pp. 187–88). Muraro, however, accepts the testimony of Andreas and Mayfreda and thus assumes that the root of the heresy originated with Guglielma, but it was elaborated by her followers. See, for example, *Guglielma e Maifreda*, pp. 26–27, and passim. Wessley also entertains the possibility of Guglielma's heretical leanings ("Enthusiasm and Heresy," pp. 55–57). Also see Wessley's discussion of the attitude of past scholars ("The Guglielmites," pp. 290–92).

157 Mayfreda admitted that she had heard this many times. But the inquisitors inscrutably neither affirmed nor denied the rumor (*Processi . . . Guglielma*, Mayfreda, p. 102).

158 Ibid., Andreas, pp. 196–98. This particular tale, however, is told in the course of his fifth interrogation. The third interrogation, in which he denies that Guglielma had ever made this claim, occurred a week earlier (p. 172).

159 Cf. Newman, *From Virile Woman*, p. 187; and Muraro, *Guglielma e Maifreda*, pp. 26–28.

160 *Processi . . . Guglielma*, Sibilia, p. 214.

161 Ibid., Francischus, p. 220 (on the political context that may have prompted Guglielma to make such a remark, see Wessley, "The Guglielmites," pp. 297–98). Andreas said that Guglielma used the same words as Christ regarding his death and resurrection: namely, "A little while, and now you shall not see me; and again a little while, and you shall see me" (John 16.16). Andreas was not actually present at the time but heard of this utterance through Jacobus de Ferno (*Processi . . . Guglielma*, p. 170).

162 *Processi . . . Guglielma*, Andreas, p. 196.

163 See the testimonies of Alegrantia, ibid., p. 224; Jacobus, p. 230; Stephanus, pp. 234, 270, 278–80. Only Aydelina, wife of Stephanus de Crimella, and Carabella refer to the visionary context (pp. 244, 246).

164 Ibid., Mayfreda, p. 102. She goes on to say that Andreas claimed he had once heard Guglielma acknowledge that she was the Holy Spirit. This interrogation occurred on 6 August. Mayfreda had been questioned four days earlier (pp. 78–80) as well as during the previous April, although this latter

testimony no longer exists.

165 Ibid., Alegrantia, pp. 226–28.

166 Ibid., Danisius, son of the late Sarandus Cotte, pp. 278–80; Marchixius, p. 304.

167 Wessley, "Enthusiasm and Heresy," pp. 155–57, 148–51. Although there is no record of torture being applied in the course of this inquisition, no scholar seems to doubt that it was used, and used freely. This is the only way to explain some of the dramatic reversals in confession that occur over a relatively short time. Lea describes it as customary to omit from the record all mention of torture (*Inquisition*, 3:100).

168 Andreas and Mayfreda complained to the witness, Jacobus de Ferno, about their earlier denunciation some seventeen years before (*Processi . . . Guglielma*, p. 230). Mayfreda also describes how the inquisitor absolved her by hitting her with a stick or a rod between the shoulders—a penance that, according to liturgist William Durand (d. 1296), should be performed when the stigma of major excommunication is lifted (p. 78; Bellacara, p. 64; William Durand, *Le Pontifical romain au MoyenAge* 3.8.6 [Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1940], pp. 610–11). Also see Girardus de Novazano's testimony in n. 176, below. With regard to the inquisition of 1296, witnesses are repeatedly asked why they failed to make certain disclosures to the earlier inquisitor, Thomas of Como (e.g., Girardus, pp. 266, 272). Thomas will surface as one of the inquisitors later on in the current trial. In their preamble to the record, the inquisitors also make reference to an earlier inquisition in Milan, where a number of the present suspects had already abjured their heresy (p. 52). But nothing else remains of these earlier inquisitions.

169 See Gui, *Practica* 5.4.12, p. 287. The exhumation occurred in 1318. As Gui reports, his followers, the Beguins of southern France discussed below, had their own account of his death read reverently at their meetings.

170 Marchixius follows his rather bold contention with the conciliatory reflection that "the inquisitors were wise and that those things that were done concerning Guglielma were done legally [*de jure*]" (*Processi . . . Guglielma*, Marchixius, p. 304).

171 See chap. 3, p. 101, above.

172 Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum* 5.21, ed. Joseph Strange (Cologne, Bonn, Brussels: J. M. Heberle, 1851), 1:302; trans. H. Von E. Scott and C. C. Swinton Bland, *The Dialogue on Miracles* (London: Routledge, 1929), 1:346–47; see Lea, *Inquisition*, 1:154. Although recognizing the impossibility of proving the authenticity of these famous words, Jacques Berlioz argues that the spirit of the remarks is in keeping with what is known about Crusade and crusaders alike. See *Tuezles tous, Dieu reconna î tra les siens: le massacre de B è ziers (22 juillet 1209) et la croisade contre les Albigeois vus par C è saire de Heisterbach* (Portetsur-Garonne: Loubati[egrave]res, 1994). Cf. the response of Conrad Dorso and John (two confederates of Conrad of Marburg) to public outcry over their excesses: "We would prefer to burn one hundred innocent among whom there is one guilty" (*Annales Wormatiensis* ann. 1231, ed. G. H. Pertz, *MGH SS*, 17:39).

173 Battista Piergili, *Vita della B. Chiara detta della Croce da Montefalco* 3.8 (Foligno: Ago-stino Alterij, 1640), pp. 237–38. The term "Fraticelli" refers to the Beguins of southern France, discussed below.

174 Ibid. 3.9, pp. 238–40.

175 Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 32.15.24, ed. Mark Adriaen, *CCSL* 143b (Turnhout: Brepols, 1985), p. 1648.

176 Girardus de Novazano had discovered this comment in the margin when

he borrowed the psalter some fifteen years earlier. He thought it referred to the Guglielmites' earlier brush with the inquisition (*Processi . . . Guglielma*, pp. 94, 268).

177 On the church's eventual decision not to heed the vox populi, see Vauchez, *Sainthood*, pp. 414–24.

178 Hostiensis, *Commentaria* ad X.3.45.1, no. 3, fol. 172; no. 8, p. 172a. This helps explain the tentativeness of Gerson's challenge to Bridget of Sweden's canonization. See chap. 7, pp. 282–83, below.

179 Vauchez, *Sainthood*, p. 337; cf. Goodich, "The Politics of Canonization in the Thirteenth Century," pp. 176–77.

180 Auvray, 31 March 1237, no. 3593.

181 AndréVauchez, "Les stigmates de Saint Fran ç ois et leurs detracteurs," *MEFRM* 80 (1968): 599. Richard Trexler argues that the earliest accounts of the stigmata make no mention of their divine origin, reflecting the probability that they were self-inflicted, in keeping with ascetical precedents, such as Mary of Oignies. See "The Stigmatized Body of Francis of Assisi: Conceived, Processed, and Disappeared," in *Froïmmigkeit im Mittelalter: Politischsoziale Kontexte, visuelle Praxis, koïrperliche Ausdrucksformen*, ed. Klaus Schreiner and Marc Münz (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2002), pp. 463–97, esp. 480 ff.

182 Vauchez, "Les stigmates," pp. 600–604.

183 There are only two other such quodlibets from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. See Gaudens Mohan's preface to his edition of this quodlibet in "Petrus Thomae on the Stigmata of St. Francis," *Franciscan Studies* 8 (1948): 285; and Vauchez, "Les stigmates," p. 609.

184 Mohan, "Petrus Thomae," Declaratio 1, 1–6, pp. 286–88. For some interesting reflections on imaginative distortions, medieval and modern, see CarolineWalker Bynum, "The Woman with the Pearl Necklace," *Common Knowledge* 8 (2002): 282–83.

185 Mohan, "Petrus Thomae," Dubitatio, ad 3, p. 289–90.

186 Ibid., Conclusio 1, p. 290.

187 Ibid., Conclusio 2, p. 291. Mohan also notes the indebtedness to Bonaventure's vita of Saint Francis (p. 292; see Bonaventure, *Legenda Sancti Francisci* 13.9–10, in *Opera omnia*, ed. Fathers of the College of Saint Bonaventure [Florence: College of Saint Bonaventure, 1898], 8:544–45).

188 Mohan, "Petrus Thomae," Conclusio 2, p. 291.

189 Ibid., Conclusio 4, p. 292.

190 Livarius Oliger, ed., "Acta inquisitoris Umbriae Fr. Angeli de Assisio contra stigmata S. Francisci negantem contra fraticellos aliosque, a. 1361," *AFH* 24 (1931): Sr. Ludovica, p. 70; Sr. Iohanna, p. 72; Sr. Helena, p. 71.

191 Sr. Ludovica seems to have already heard Leonardus express himself on this subject (ibid.,p. 70).

192 Ibid., Sr. Ludovica, p. 70.

193 Ibid., Sr. Pucciarella, p. 70.

194 Ibid.

195 Ibid., Sr. Helena, p. 71.

196 Ibid., Sr. Pucciarella, p. 70; cf. Sr. Thomassutia, p. 71; Sr. Andrea, p. 71.

197 Ibid., p. 72; for his penance, see pp. 73–74.

198 Bernard Gui, *De fundatione et prioribus conventuum provinciarum Tolosanae et provinciae Ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. P. A. Amargier, Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum Historica, 24 (Rome: Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1961), pp. 202–4; see Alan Fried-lander's *The Hammer of the Inquisitors: Brother Bernard D è licieux and the Struggle against the Inquisition in Fourteenth-Century France* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 105, 300.

[199] See the brief interrogatory designed for questioning Cathars, the Concorrezo (a particular sect of Cathars), and Waldensians (Ignatius von Doïllinger, ed., *Beitraïge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters* [Munich: C. H. Beck'sche, 1890], no. 20, 2:319).

[200] Paolini and Orioli, *Acta*, Benichaxa Martinus testifying against Paulus Trintinellus, 1:48; Bonigrinus of Verona, 1:13–14; Julianus Saglimbene testifying against Honebene of Mantua, 1:46. On local hostility to the inquisitors, see Paolini, *L'Eresia a Bologna*, 1:29–32; Lansing, *Power and Purity*, pp. 151–57.

[201] Paolini and Orioli, *Acta*, Corbicincus, son of the former Benevenutus de Gaglano, 1:60–61. Also see Gui's description of the Waldensians, who are likewise characterized as denying that anyone has the right to judge or put anyone to death (*Practica* 5.3, p. 246; trans. *WE*, p. 389). In a similar vein, Petrus Maurinus of Montaillou considered that anyone denouncing heretics was committing a sin against the Holy Spirit, for which there was no redemption (Duvernoy, ed., *Registre*, 3:232–33). Cf. parallel denials of all judgments, including the final judgment (chap. 2, pp. 76–77, above).

[202] Paolini and Orioli, *Acta*, Meglore, daughter of Julianus cap. Sancti Dominici, no. 26, p. 54.

[203] Ibid., Phylippa, daughter of Dom. Castelanus de Buschittis, 1:253; Father Coradinus of Parma of the Carmelites, reporting the words of Ser Paulus, 1:59. A number of other witnesses testify to Paulus's remarks. See, for example, Dom. Paulus Trintinellus, 1:56.

[204] Ibid., Jacobina, wife of the late Bertolus cap. Sancti Thome de Merchato, 1:211; a different Jacobina, daughter of Iohannes de Ricolfis, 1:211; also see Domina Lucia, wife of Andrea de Bondinata, 1:214; Margarita, wife of Bonicasa cap. Sancti Thome de Merchato, 1:212; Domina Benevenuta, wife of Boniacobus cap. Sancti Benedicti, 1:225; Domina Bexe, daughter of the late Ugolinus Canbonus, 1:225; Phylippa, daughter of Dom. Castelanus de Buschittis, 1:253; Mandina, daughter of Gandulfus de Gisso, 1:290; cf. Domina Diana, daughter of the late Albertus de Schalamis, 1:193; Sr. Borgha, daughter of the late Dom. Hettolus cap. Sancti Damiani, 1:149; Domina Impereria, wife of the late Dom. Michaelis cap. Sancte Marie, 1:177; Benevenuta, daughter of Florius cap. Sancti Martinus de Apoxa, 1:181–82; Domina Garda, wife of Ugolinus Buvalellus, 1:210; Domina Cexaria, wife of Michaelis Acarius, 1:210; Domina Marina, wife of the late Bonifacius Canestrarius, 1:210; Iacobina, wife of the late Bertolus cap. Sancti Thome de Merchato, 1:211; Thomaxina, wife of Magister Petrus cap. Sancti Gilii, 1:226; Cicilia, daughter of Dom. Iacobus Berardus, 1:258. Clearly women were particularly outraged at these exhumations and burnings. The above witnesses were Cathar sympathizers, but this view of the inquisitors' greed was common. See, for example, the testimony of an adherent to the Pseudo-Apostles (i.e., followers of Dolcino), Sr. Lacarina, daughter of Jacobinus de Pede de Plumatio (2:525). She also refers to a certain Gilia, widow of Iohannes Savius, who spent considerable money on a bribe in order to avoid being cited (2:527).

[205] This rumor was abetted by the local Franciscans, to whom Andreas immediately appealed for help when the inquisitors appeared. Brother Daniel even supplied them with documentation sustain the claim that both inquisitors had been suspended by the pope (*Processi . . . Guglielma*, Beltramus de Ferno, pp. 204–8). Lea points out that the helpful friar had been called before one of the inquisitors some twenty years previously and was probably acting on a personal vendetta (Lea, *Inquisition*, 3:99). The inquisitors were also interested in learning who was spreading this rumor (see, for example, *Processi . . .*

Guglielma, Jacobus de Ferno, p. 68).

206 The process for the trial is extant. See Alan Friedlander's edition, *Processus Bernardi Delitiosi: The Trial of Fr. Bernard D è licieux, 3 September–8 December 1319* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1996); Gui, *De fundatione*, p. 204. Also see Friedlander, *The Hammer of the Inquisitors*, pp. 258 ff.

207 See Paolini and Orioli, *Acta*, Iacobus, rector of S. Thomas de Merchato, 1:37–40. Iacobus pleaded ignorance, claiming he thought Rosaflora was reconciled with the church, probably because he was the means of her reconciliation. Note, however, that a confessor's testimony cannot clear a person of the charge of heresy (see chap. 1, pp. 21, 26, 36, above). Iacobus had to oversee the task of exhuming and burning her remains "with his own hands, by his own labor, and at his own expense." Iacobus, moreover, was excommunicated and suspended from office (1:298–99). This sentence was, however, lifted (2:597–98). Paolini notes that the local clergy's solidarity with the laity was typical (1:37 n. 1). Rosaflora's husband, Bonigrinus of Verona, had initially denied all charges of heresy, until he was shown the confession he had made in 1283. Then he admitted to his Cathar beliefs—actually shouting them at the inquisitor at one point. He refused to recant, an act that the inquisitors desired even of condemned heretics, instead maintaining that he wished to persist until death (1:11–12, 16). Both Domina Diana, daughter of the late Albertus de Schalamis (1:239, 193), and Domina Contessa, daughter of Dom. Phylippus, were further outraged that when Bonigrinus asked for the sacrament on his deathbed, it was denied him (1:182–83). On the religious beliefs of Bonigrinus, see Lansing, *Power and Purity*, pp. 88–92.

208 The documents for the trial of Marguerite and Guiard are edited by Paul Verdeyen, "Le proc[egrave]s d'inquisition contre Marguerite Porete et Guiard de Cressonessart (1309–1310)," *Revue d'histoire eccl è siastique* 81 (1986): 47–94; see esp. pp. 62–63, 65–67. Also see Robert Lerner, "The 'Angel of Philadelphia' in the Reign of Philip the Fair: The Case of Guiard of Cressonessart," in *Order and Innovation in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honor of Joseph R. Strayer*, ed. W. Jordan and T. Ruiz (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1972), pp. 343–64, and idem, "Ecstatic Dissent," *Speculum* 67 (1992): 56–57.

209 See Friedlander, *The Hammer of the Inquisitors*, pp. 235–37.

210 Gui, *Practica* 3.20, pp. 111–17. Cf. the general form for those obstructing the office of the inquisition (1.37, pp. 31–32).

211 On Conrad, see chap. 3, pp. 97–100, above; on the end of Robert's career, see chap. 2, n. 94, above; chap. 5, p. 229, below.

212 I will be examining the testimonies of the eight Beguins who were interrogated at Clermont-l'He è rault and Lod[egrave]ve between 1319 and 1322, and the twelve Beguins who were interrogated at Narbonne before 1325. These testimonies have been preserved in the Doat Collection (Paris: Biblioth[egrave]que Nationale), vol. 28, fols. 11v–27r; and 114r–36r. For an overview of the schism among the Franciscans that divided the order into two camps, the Conventuals and the Spirituals, and the subsequent persecution of the latter, see Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 2d ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), pp. 205–14. Also see Gui's very detailed description of their beliefs and recommendations on how to interrogate them in *Practica* 5.4, pp. 264–87. On their commemoration of Peter John Olivi's death, see n. 169, above. Lerner cites the Spiritual Franciscans as an important precedent for the use of spiritual illumination to resist church discipline ("Ecstatic Dissent," pp. 53–55).

213 Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society*, pp. 76–78; cf. Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, pp. 210–11.

214 Manenta, wife of Bernardus Arnaud of Lod[egrave]ve, Doat, vol. 28, fol. 14r.

215 Bernardus Malaura of Lod[egrave]ve, Doat, vol. 28, fols. 17r, 18r.

216 Bernardus Pirotas of Lod[egrave]ve, Doat, vol. 28, fol. 25v.

217 Bernardus Sabri of Olargues, Doat, vol. 28, fol. 123r.

218 Berengarius Jaoule of Lod[egrave]ve, Doat, vol. 28, fol. 19r.

219 David of Augsburg's *Tractatus* claims that the collection of bones is an infallible way to discern heretics (col. 1787). Also see his derisive account of how bones were discovered in the coffer of a certain woman, a vile kitchen maid (*focaria*), whom they were about to release as innocent (col. 1788). This is one of the many reasons that the authorities were usually careful to ensure that no potential "relics" remained at the site of execution. Thus a papal formulary contains an entry concerning individuals preserving bits of wood from the executions. See H. C. Lea, ed., *A Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary in the Thirteenth Century* (Philadelphia: Lea Bros., 1892), no. 42, p. 60.

220 Berengaria, wife of Guillermus of Narbonne, Doat, vol. 28, fol. 122r.

221 Galharda, wife of master Bernardus Sabri of Olargues, Doat, vol. 28, fols. 125v–26r. Her doubtful tone was due to the influence of a certain religious who attempted to unseat her belief.

222 Bernardus Durban of Lod[egrave]ve, Doat, vol. 28, fols. 12r–v.

223 Raymondus Durban of Clermont, Doat, vol. 28, fols. 26r–v. He too was present at the execution. Cf. the case of Petrus Egleysa of Narbonne, described as a child cleric of fourteen (*clericus puer*), who was imprisoned for defending his brother Johannes, as well as other members of his family who were burned as heretics. When he refused to take an oath before the inquisitors, he was imprisoned for several days until he changed his mind (Doat, vol. 28, fols. 117r–18r).

224 Martinus of Sanctus Antonius, alias Alegre of Clermont, Doat, vol. 28, fols. 16r–v.

225 Bernard Pirotas, Doat, vol. 28, fols. 22r–v.

226 Martinus of Sanctus Antonius, alias Alegre of Clermont, Doat, vol. 28, fols. 16r–v.

227 Berangarius Rocha of Clermont, Doat, vol. 28, fol. 14v.

228 Eymeric, *Directorium* pt. 3, p. 294.

229 Jacoba Amorosia, wife of Amorosus Loreti of Lode`ve, Doat, vol. 28, fol. 13v.

230 Bernardus Malaura, butcher of Lod[egrave]ve, Doat, vol. 28, fol. 18r.

231 Berengarius Jaoule, merchant from Lod[egrave]ve, Doat, vol. 28, fol. 20v.

232 Philippus von Limborch, *Historia inquisitionis cui subiungitur Liber sententiarum inquisitionis Tholosonae* (Amsterdam: Henricus Wetstenium, 1692), pp. 384–85; see Given's account, *Inquisition and Medieval Society*, pp. 95–96. Like many other Beguins, Petrus was also an avid follower of Olivi. Cf. the testimony of Petrus Hospitalis (Limborch, *Historia inquisitionis*, pp. 386–92).

233 Ibid., pp. 385–86.

234 Given seems to accept Gui's judgment regarding Petrus's mental instability (*Inquisition and Medieval Society*, pp. 95–96).

235 Gui, *Practica* 5.4.7, p. 279. On negative views regarding the inquisitors, including the perception of them as heretics, see Paolini, "Gli ordini mendicanti," pp. 704–9.

Chapter Five

Between Two Deaths: The Living Mystic

When, therefore, it is asked whether [Francis] is of greater merit because he has the stigmata rather than the

crown of the martyr, Isay that if there were to be a comparison

with respect to the person, Iso believe that [the stigmata]

were a greater sign of merit and prerogative than

if he had had martyrdom. . . . for [martyrdom] is common to many, but [the stigmata] to none.

(Anonymous)

Iunderstood that St. John had endured such great sorrow

over the passion of Christ and over the sorrows of

the mother of Christ that Iwas convinced, and still am, that

he is more than a martyr.

(Angela of Foligno, d. 1309)

"Mother Iam dead." And the other, pierced through, answered: "Woe is me, daughter, what are you

The Virgin answered: "Mother, Iam entirely dead." saying?"

(Giacomo Scalza, *The Life of Vanna*

d'Orvieto, d. 1306)[1]

THE DEAD HERETIC had gained the field as the martyr, something that ecclesiastical authorities seemed to acknowledge by tacitly ceding this ground. The passing of the orthodox martyr corresponded to the rise of the living saint—an individual who made the expression "dead to the world" vibrate with new meaning. Indeed, the fact that the anonymous Franciscan quoted above will actually argue the superiority of the stigmata over physical martyrdom demonstrates just how successfully orthodoxy had negotiated this transition. Angela of Foligno's parallel reasoning demonstrates her quick assimilation of the martyr's demotion.

Both James of Vitry and Thomas of Cantimpré, two of the clerical masterminds in redirecting orthodox conceptions of martyrdom, had laid claim to the indeterminate gray zone between two deaths on behalf of their holy clients. But such claims were voiced only after the individuals in question were dead. Proving that a living person had already entered that middle place in between was a delicate, and even

hazardous, task. It was dangerous, and potentially heretical, to venerate someone as a saint while that person was still alive.[2] This stark fact brings the possible obstacles confronted by the promoters of a living saint immediately into sharp focus. Moreover, papal canonization had established a new evidentiary standard that required careful planning on the part of a holy client's sponsors, and this planning generally had to begin long before the putative saint's death. Evidence of a virtuous life needed to be chronicled, miracles during his or her lifetime needed to be witnessed by others and duly recorded, revelations needed to be transcribed, and the individual's *fama* as holy needed to be carefully disseminated. If the center of a putative cult was not a self-abnegating princess (like Elisabeth of Hungary), a saintly crusading king (like Louis IX, d. 1270), an angelic pope (like Celestine V), or a pious bishop (like Thomas of Cantilupe, d. 1282), but simply a lowly layperson who had no access to automatic visibility by virtue of his or her estate, the promotion would be infinitely more difficult.[3]

The inquisitional procedure would perform a critical function in providing these proofs, even though, for a number of reasons, this role is not always as apparent as might be expected. A saint's confessor was usually the chief purveyor of proof on behalf of his holy client's sanctity. As the Middle Ages progressed, the confessor's role as promoter of the "cult" of a putative living saint would come under heavy fire from powerful ecclesiastics like John Gerson. The wise confessor would trim his behavior accordingly. Even the extremely partial John of Marienwerder wished to conceal the fact that he was recording Dorothea's revelations, given what this activity implied, and was thus angry when she unintentionally leaked news of their furtive transcriptions to an outsider.[4] For a confessor to institute a formal inquest with a view to proving his living penitent's claims to sanctity would be decidedly counterproductive. There was also the question of sophistication. In the early thirteenth century, *inquisitio* was the most advanced of the various proof-generating methods available. With the exception of Italy, where Roman law was in use by secular authorities from the late twelfth century, the dissemination of inquisitional methods beyond advanced clerical circles was uneven.[5] The more sophisticated a promoter was, the more inclined to collect evidence against an imaginary inquisitional grid. Thus even if the methods of gathering evidence were informal, the promoter would still aspire to a level of proof that could withstand the rigors of the future process of canonization.

The somatic nature of female spirituality meant that the requisite proofs of holiness were often of a physical nature. Since a holy person frequently received revelations in the course of a rapture, special care

was taken to secure satisfying proofs of this condition. Rapture was generally considered to be an out-of-body experience that resulted from contact with the divine. The prototypical rapture was experienced by Saint Paul, who had described how he was snatched up to third heaven, although it was unclear to him whether or not he had experienced an actual physical elevation in the course of this experience (2 Cor. 12.2–4). Women were believed to have a particular propensity to rapture—premised on the fragility, and hence susceptibility, of the female body.[6] If the confessor could furnish evidence that the rapture was genuine, this was an important step toward establishing that the woman in question was in communication with the divine.

The fact that Paul did not rule out the possibility of physical elevation meant that rapture was potentially bristling with dramatic proofs—at a minimum entailing a complete suspension of the senses, but even allowing for the occasional levitation. According to Thomas of Cantimpré, the entire community of nuns looked on as Lutgard of Aywi[egrave]res was "elevated two cubits from the earth into the air."[7] A Dominican confrere had additionally told Thomas of a certain holy woman who could not be confined by cloisters, locks, or chains. When she was moved by the spirit, she was just like an arrow shot from the bow of a powerful archer and she soared like a bird.[8] Lydwine of Schiedam (d. 1433) was also reputed to have been physically raptured to various places—most spectacularly to the Holy Land.[9] When Christina Mirabilis prayed "and the divine grace of contemplation descended upon her, all her limbs were gathered together into a ball as if they were hot wax" and she curled up like a hedgehog; when in rapture Christina would "roll and whirl like a hoop," while a "wondrous harmony sounded between her throat and breast."[10] Elsewhere, Thomas describes how a certain woman in Brabant would be "seized in spirit" whenever there was discussion of eternal joy: her face would become incandescent, her eyes would close, and she would emit the most beautiful involuntary song, again between her throat and breast.[11] The enrapt Vanna of Orvieto, burning with divine love, would sweat so profusely that she could not wear clothes; she became so still and deathlike that flies settled on her half-open eyes, but she did not blink. Sometimes she would be elevated many cubits above the ground.[12] Once when she descended from the mountain of contemplation, her face was fiery red "from the furnace of divine fire."[13]

But such descriptions, impressive as they were, did little to establish the objective reality of a given mystic's condition, even with the hearsay corroboration of partisan witnesses. A holy woman's supporters needed to assemble more substantive proofs, preferably

from witnesses who allegedly had been skeptical of the holy person's claims and were subsequently converted. The life of Margaret of Cortona (d. 1297) attempts to provide just such proofs. Margaret's dramatic raptures constituted an unforgettable spectacle. On one occasion she was permitted to experience Christ's passion during an ecstasy—a performance that drew every parishioner to the church of Saint Francis to watch as she gnashed her teeth and lost color, heat, pulse, and the power of her senses.[14] The local community of Franciscans, suspicious of such high jinks, took advantage of one of her raptures to throw her body around—presumably testing her degree of alienation from her senses.[15] Similarly, in the life of Christine of Stommeln (d. 1312), a certain Father Albrandino was disappointed and suspected fraud when the woman's body was insufficiently rigid in the early stages of rapture. But he was chastened when he returned later and found her body hard, and totally contrite when she emerged from the rapture and he saw the stigmatic image of the cross on her palms. He did figurative penance for his earlier disbelief: his hand, holding hers, was trapped against the wall when she suddenly returned to her rapture.[16] Occasionally the forthcoming proofs were exceptionally cruel. Upon the orders of Charles of Anjou, the immobile Douceline (d. 1274) was jabbed with nails and chisels, and even had molten lead poured over her feet.[17] Caroline Walker Bynum has indicated the extent to which women's identification with the broken body of the suffering Christ was implicated in their intense eucharistic devotion. This analogy is extended and deepened by the above proofs, since the women—poked, prodded, and even tortured to prove their integrity—to some extent mirror the kind of abuse visited on the host, Christ's sacramental body, in tales of host desecration.[18]

Sometimes outer agents were unavailable or limited in just what they were prepared to test, and confessors were forced to show their hands by conducting their own experiments on their holy charges. John Matteotti, confessor to Frances of Rome (d. 1440), used the leverage of "holy obedience" to vindicate the authenticity of her enrapt state. Not only did he make Frances speak about her experience in the course of her raptures, as anomalous as speech acts in this state must be, but he also obliged the enrapt saint to stand, sit, and walk on command.[19] Occasionally, John even dared to make public such demonstrations of Frances's visionary obedience. For example, once when she was in ecstasy, John ordered her to adore the sacrament, which was at that moment being consecrated in the adjoining chapel. Much to the amazement of bystanders, she instantly obeyed, though never departing from her ecstasy.[20]

But we know from the process of canonization that John also staged less dignified and sometimes rather brutal experiments. On a number

of occasions, wishing to probe and demonstrate the extent of his holy charge's ecstatic passivity, John told her spiritual daughter Rita "to torture her harshly." Rita used all the force she could muster in an effort to separate Frances's hands, which were habitually joined when she was in this state. Frances remained like marble until John ordered her to move. In another instance, John requested that several of the sisters poke Frances in the face, still eliciting no response.[21] John, ever the obliging impresario, even invited the bishop to touch Frances while she was in ecstasy. The bishop refused, however, thinking himself unworthy.[22] Although insensible in the ecstasy proper, Frances does mention in the course of one of her conversant raptures that she often felt the ill-effects of these experiments after the fact.[23] Saint Paul confirms the possibility of such delayed reactions when he appears in a vision and proclaims that the enrapt individual "can suffer torments and feel nothing."[24]

The preceding proofs are, or are made to appear, spontaneous. When more formal proofs are provided, the means by which they were acquired often follow the general contours of an inquest. As might be expected, the authorities undertaking an inquiry into miraculous claims made on behalf of a person still living were sometimes hostile, but almost always wary. This is not necessarily a bad thing from the point of view of the promoters of a given cult, provided that one succeeded in convincing the skeptic of the reality of the subject's claims. One could capitalize on the familiar trajectory by which a skeptical investigator becomes an avid convert, as occurred in the course of Berengar of Saint-Affrique's investigation of the circumstances surrounding the revelation of Clare of Montefalco's heart. Even so, the reality of the persecutor turned devotee—a compelling topos from the time of Saint Paul—needs to be regarded with caution, precisely because of its blatant propagandistic potential.

Abbot Philip of Clairvaux's observation of Elisabeth of Spalbeek professes to be an instance of just such a change in attitude. Philip first learned of Elisabeth's Christological marvels in 1267, when conducting a visitation of Cistercian houses in the area. Although any spiritual irregularities among the laity would be, theoretically, the terrain of the bishop of Li[egrave]ge, Elisabeth lived very near the Cistercian community of nuns at Herkenrode, and it is probably there that Philip first learned of her claims. No doubt her reputation had created quite a stir among the nuns. So one can well imagine why Philip took it upon himself to investigate, especially considering the close interaction between the Cistercians and the religiously inclined women of the area, which dates back to the twelfth century. "Not believing these reports, I went and saw with my own eyes and proved [*probavi*] that not even half of the things had been related to me.

Indeed I wished to see the things heard and to scrutinize [*scrutari*] the things seen: to reveal the things scrutinized and confess the honorable thing Iconsidered." [25]

Leading off with the dramatic claim that Elisabeth bears the stigmata of Christ, and an account of how they appeared, Philip then proceeds to render an exceptionally detailed report of her spiritual practices—including her multiple raptures, her painstaking reenactment of the passion, her behavior during mass—all of which were coordinated with the various canonical hours. He returns to the question of the stigmata, providing the support of other eyewitnesses from his clerical entourage:

> I judge it also should here be inserted that I and my companions, abbots and monks, in the middle of the night and at certain other hours saw blood going out of her eyes and staining the linen clothing in which she was dressed with the drops flowing from there. Like-wise, while we were watching, considerable blood gushed through the wounds in her hands and feet. Likewise also from her side on Friday at noon through an opening in her clothes made around her nipple we saw blood flowing out that was not entirely red and that was mixed with water. And the wool vestment that stuck to her flesh was stained with the same blood.[26]

Blood also ran out from her nails, which Philip interprets as symbolizing the painful binding of Christ's arms and hands.

Philip's inquiries were facilitated by Elisabeth's confessor, William, abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Saint-Trond and to whom she was consigned by the local bishop. (William also happened to be one of Elisabeth's relatives.) He is described as "a venerable and religious man, of holy and honest life, of clear and integral reputation and great authority. . . . And thus this venerable father . . . remained always with us throughout these things and acted as our pedagogue and faithful and sure interpreter of the words of the virgin."[27] William is, of course, useful in attesting to Elisabeth's exemplary confessional practice, and, as with the Beguine mystics, this attention to confession is manifested in her uncanny power of compelling individuals with secret sins to confess—an ability that she practices repeatedly among Philip's entourage.[28] But William also provides important testimony to past marvels. For example, on Good Friday of the previous year, the bloody marks from the crown of thorns circled her head like a garland.[29] Philip could himself attest to her abstemiousness since one of his companions from Clairvaux had the opportunity of feeding Elisabeth with spoonfuls of milk. She would take only three mouthfuls, and these with difficulty. The same is true of the watered

wine she was offered: “with good conscience Idare to say that a dove drinks more from a stream or well than that virgin from a cup.”[30]

If Berengar of Saint-Affrique’s example demonstrates how a hostile inquisition could be turned into a process of canonization after Clare’s death, Philip of Clairvaux’s account demonstrates how an inquest could become something of a hagiography while the individual was still alive. Indeed, perhaps the safest way to write something resembling a saint’s vita of a living subject is to disguise it as an inquest of sorts. Philip’s conclusion is an avid testimonial to how the different manifestations of Elisabeth’s spirituality serve to vindicate the entire faith, and it is unmistakably hagiographical in nature.

> Our virgin, whose whole life is a miracle, rather whose whole self is a miracle, as appears from the things written above, symbolizes and explains not only the crucified Christ in her body but also the mystical body of Christ, that is, the church. For behold she represents in the distinction of the hours the rites of the universal Church divinely instituted . . . ; in her stigmata and punishment she adds to the faith of the passion; in jubilation and joy, of the resurrection after punishment; in her raptures, the ascension; in her modesty and revelations and spiritual life, the mission of the Holy Spirit.[31]

The way in which Elisabeth’s piety is invoked is an extremely fulsome example of how the piety of the women of Li[egrave]ge was typically deployed to affirm various orthodox truths. And yet this inquest-turned-vita should also be adduced as evidence for a pattern that becomes ever more insistent, and assumes a darker meaning, as the Middle Ages progress: the time for woman as an important proof of orthodoxy is drawing to a close; the growing insistence that a woman prove her orthodoxy, and the mechanisms for undertaking this proof, are not far behind.

But Philip’s inquest served to vindicate Elisabeth. Had a Franciscan headed the inquiry, however, he would almost certainly have come up with a very different judgment. Jealous of what they perceived as their founder’s special prerogative, the Franciscans were hostile to all rival claims of the stigmata. In fact, Elisabeth, though not mentioned by name, was clearly a target for the Franciscan Gilbert of Tournai, who wrote the treatise *Collection of the Scandals of the Church* for the party assembled at the Council of Lyons in 1271. Gilbert bitterly critiques the various ranks of the church, methodically beginning with the secular clergy before turning his attention to the various contemporary religious orders. His subsequent treatment of different lay estates ends with a contemptuous characterization of the Beguines.

It is in this context that we encounter Elisabeth, even though there is no evidence actually linking her with the Beguine movement. Gilbert's discussion of her claims not only concludes the chapter on the Beguines but also provides a skeptical close to the entire treatise: "There is one among the wretched little women [*mulierculas*] of this sort, and the public rumor [*fama*] already arose that she is signed with the stigmata of Christ. But if this is true, it should not be fostered in hidden places, but this should be known openly; if it is not true, the hypocrisy and pretense should be confounded."[32] Vauchez believes that Philip finished his inquest-cum-vita only in 1270, several years after the encounter he describes.[33] Either Gilbert was unaware of Philip's recent testimonial or, if aware, dismissed it as insufficiently rigorous. But Elisabeth's reputation doubtless remained controversial. In 1276, Philip III consulted a Beguine prophetess, identified by some historians as Elisabeth, to learn whether or not his beloved second wife, Mary of Brabant, was indeed responsible for poisoning his son. The chronicler relating the incident, however, referred to the Beguine as a *pseudoprophetissa*.[34]

The contours of the inquest are still more pronounced in the 1421 examination of Lydwine of Schiedam, whose reputation for holiness was grounded almost entirely in the wretched condition of her disintegrating body.[35] Conducted under the auspices of the local authorities—including the bailiff, mayor, burgomasters, sheriffs, and town councillors—the inquiry was primarily intended to ascertain and describe Lydwine's physical state. The document relates in detail how her rotting body was infested with maggots, which had to be diverted by a poultice of flour and honey so that they would not torture Lydwine beyond her endurance. She was further perforated by three huge holes: "each is fully as big as the inner hollow or bottom of a common bowl and they are black like pitch, as it appeared to those looking within and gazing. . . . All these things are proved and through experience are found thus."[36] Blood would periodically gush from the various orifices of her face. To move Lydwine was both difficult and dangerous: she had to be lifted in thick woolen bandages; otherwise her whole body would have fallen to pieces. She was forced to sleep on a bed of straw, since she would most certainly have stuck to any other surface. For the seven years leading up to the inquiry, Lydwine had remained immobile, altogether impossible to move and wracked by a fever that would recur every three days with sweats and chills. All of these horrors and more Lydwine endured with great fortitude and patience, perpetually deprived of sleep and eating practically nothing. No doctor is mentioned as having accompanied these officials. Yet it is entirely possible that this was not deemed necessary, as no trained eye was required to appreciate Lydwine's

miserable condition.[37]

Apart from the desire to gather precise information, it is not exactly clear what spirit motivated the above inquest.Were the townspeople simply attempting to put some ugly rumors to rest, or were they already attempting to vindicate inchoate claims of sanctity? But whether or not Lydwine's lay examiners approached in the spirit of skepticism, they departed in the spirit of piety. Their findings were written up as an open letter addressed to all the faithful, who were to be edified through Lyd-wine's perseverance, and the letter was then officially sealed with the town seal. The public nature of the document and its scrupulous attention to a detailed description of Lydwine's physical infirmities bears certain similarities to the notarized report drawn up in the presence of the *podesta*` describing the instruments discovered in Clare of Montefalco's heart. The examination conducted on Lydwine was destined to become a major source for her subsequent hagiographer, which was also true in the case of Clare.

But Clare's examination was essentially a postmortem: its purpose was to establish the presence of miraculous images wrought on a cadaver as a prologue to the wider process, which would introduce the conventional ways in which her body showed life in death. In contrast, Lydwine's inquest was intended to ascertain unmistakable signs of death and decomposition in a person who was still living. Moreover, the very fact that such an inquiry was visited on a living person in certain ways brings it into alignment with the circumstances surrounding the inquisition against heresy, as does its purpose. For if Lydwine's examiners hoped to establish proofs that she hovered somewhere between life and death, the inquisitors into heresy sought to establish proofs that would successfully move a living person into the amorphous zone between two deaths, to await the action of the secular arm.

The cases of Elisabeth of Spalbeek and Lydwine of Schiedam, two dramatic demonstrations of female somatism, also suggest ways in which the new evidentiary criteria for proof of sanctity were responsible for the ever increasing spiral of physicality that characterized the spirituality of late medieval women, or at least the way in which their spirituality was ultimately represented.[38] Indeed, neither Clare nor Lydwine, pious women that they were, would have had much of a case for sanctity without their respective somatic claims.

The zeal for documentary evidence in support of the claims of a living saint in all probability peaked in early modern Italy when various holy women became figureheads for ruling Italian families. In particular, Ercole d'Este, duke of Ferrara, went to a great deal of trouble and expense to smuggle the holy stigmatic Lucia of Narni (d.

1544) from her native Viterbo and establish her in a religious foundation in his city.[39] He was thus prepared to take decisive measures to ensure that her claims to sanctity were both known and honored. To this end, he wrote a short treatise that contained an extraordinary repertoire of eyewitness testimonies, sworn statements, and official seals. For his own part, Ercole claims, "Truly we saw and touched the stigmata not once but many times: and in the presence of many—both physicians and other men of excellence and preeminence in every respect; we touched them and caused them to be stroked [*palpari*]. . . . Therefore we brought these things forward to be revealed to all; and let them believe what things we heard, saw, touched, and firmly hold. And let them know that we have neither said nor affirmed anything about which we are not able [to furnish] proof [*probationem*]."[40] Ercole's testimony is authenticated with his ducal seal. But the labors of this Ercole were undertaken at least partially in response to the rumors that he may have been responsible for fabricating evidence, charges to which he himself makes reference. Thus in order to ensure the probity of his own name, as well as the reputation of Sister Lucia, he further solicits the sworn statements of various ecclesiastical and secular rulers (all of them appropriately authenticated) to echo almost verbatim his testimony and denounce such rumors.[41]

Somatic proofs of sanctity were attended by an incumbent literalism that would leave no metaphor untapped. Thus in the early thirteenth century, Elisabeth of Hungary would say she had no need of crosses or icons since she carried the crucifixion in her heart, a remark made in a spirit similar to Paul's profession that he carried the signs of the passion on his body (Gal. 6.17).[42] Less than a century later, Clare ofMontefalco's parallel claim, made repeatedly during her lifetime, was interpreted literally.Moreover, the nuns' literalism was rewarded, since Christ had indeed inscribed his passion on Clare's body. The process through which the word becomes flesh, whereby women progressively become, in the words of Michel de Certeau, "living Bibles," certainly may have been the work of God.[43] Yet his work corresponded to the increasing pressures for proof required by the new evidentiary standards adopted in the High Middle Ages.

THE FRAUD AND HER SISTERS

> In order to gain more fully the confidence of the heretics,
>
> Master Rudolph used to put on a rapt expression, and pretend that he had been caught up to heaven in the spirit, and in their conventicles afterwards would relate to
>
> them what he said he had seen.

(Caesarius of Heisterbach)[44]

He transfigured himself into an angel with the aid of certain gewgaws. . . . When she saw this pure white object advancing towards her, the woman fell upon her knees before it. The Angel gave her

his blessing, helped her to her feet, and motioned her to get into bed . . .

and the Angel lay down at his votary's side. . . . He flew without wings several times before the night

was over . . . which he supplemented with a running commentary on the glories of heaven.

(Boccaccio, *Decameron*)[45]

The cases of Guglielma of Milan and Armannus Punzilupus of Ferrara are vivid instances in which formal inquiries were responsible for exposing some very dubious claims to sanctity. Yet however vitiated their orthodoxy may have been, there is no doubt that the putative saints in question had been genuinely pious, at least according to their own lights. But there were also instances where individuals appropriated the symbols of holiness for personal gain.[46] Certain kinds of fraud were particularly germane to men. The kind of pretense described by Caesarius was in keeping with a long tradition of clerics posing as believers to penetrate an orthodox cell and akin to the kind of tricks permitted to inquisitors. Boccaccio's "angel" was only a very flamboyant instance of yet another trope already associated with men in the pastoral epistles: the predatory charlatan who assumed a posture of holiness in order to seduce vulnerable women. The female fraud is generally depicted as subscribing to a still more ambitious and dangerous program, seeking to impose her claims on the church at large—men and women, clergy and laity alike. If successful, she could achieve a visibility and power allegedly supported by a divine warrant—one that was otherwise out of reach by virtue of her gender.

Lucia of Narni was believed to have been temporarily successful in perpetrating just such a scheme. Despite herculean efforts at obtaining proof, Ercole d'Este seems to have been incapable of quelling the gossip that beset his court prophet. But almost immediately after the death of her patron, Lucia's claims to sanctity were demolished once and for all. According to rumor, Lucia was surprised by some of the other sisters while she was in the process of manually renewing her stigmata. Although this charge was never formally proven, she dropped from public view.[47] Inquiries of varying degrees of formality led to similar exposures. What follows are three cases of putative women mystics: the first involving a clear-cut fraud; the second, possible fraud; and a third hovering in a gray zone of indeterminacy. Each of these women attempted to attract a following, and all of them would fail in their attempts for different reasons. Yet these notable

failures are interesting since they demonstrate what the women themselves thought was necessary for being renowned and venerated during their own lifetimes.

The first instance occurred in the thirteenth century in the diocese of Metz. According to the chronicler Richer of Sens, a certain woman of the city of Marsal, appropriately named Sybil, successfully imitated the spiritual practices of the local Beguines, thereby conning the entire diocese.[48] Some highlights of her fraudulent repertoire were her three-day raptures, during which she ostensibly refused food and drink, only to indulge herself late at night;[49] conversations with angels (after which aromatic spices were spread to simulate the angelic presence in keeping with the expectations of certain contemporary theologians);[50] struggles with demons (punctuated by the feathers of torn pillows); and conversations between demons and angels (with Sybil ventriloquizing each voice).

For obvious reasons, most of Sybil's chicanery was perpetrated in private, with the admiring populace on the outside of a closed door, but there was one important exception. Sometimes in the evening, she would sally forth, dressed in a hairy demonsuit in order to terrify the surrounding countryside with vociferous threats against that pious virgin Sybil. (She fondly referred to this garb as her *larva*—an especially appropriate term since it could mean either a devil or a mask.) Thus disguised, she once railed against Sybil's intervention on behalf of a recently deceased individual, reputed to be wicked, whose soul she swept up in a three-day rapture, ultimately preserving the deceased from the flames that he had so richly deserved. Sybil's sartorial aspirations also simulated celestial glory. On the day after her successful demonic caper, the bishop entered her chamber to discover her rosy-faced, "as if sleeping with the most subtle, white material around her, and her head covering was so subtle that it seemed never to have been made by human hands. Moreover, she lay sleeping, having so subtle a breath, that scarcely could it be perceived by anyone whether she breathed or not."[51] In answer to the bishop's questions, her host volunteered that Sybil was often discovered appearing thus after her celestial raptures. The angels themselves were said to provide her with these otherworldly ornaments, in addition to making her bed. The bishop was impressed with Sybil's claims. Thus both he and his followers scrupulously made use of the water that they had been told was blessed by the angels and had the power to fend off demons, sprinkling it over themselves as well as imbibing it. Apparently the bishop toyed with the idea of building Sybil a church where she could live what he characterized as a completely otherworldly existence "because she did not eat, drink, or humanly live." (Presumably this meant that the bishop intended to construct an

anchorhold for her, perhaps attached to a new chapel.) Then people would be able to flock from all over and observe the marvels that God worked through Sybil.

Sybil was eventually exposed when simulating a debate between angels and demons that ostensibly occurred while she was in rapture. Since she had predicted her rapture ahead of time, a number of clerics were in attendance, including the bishop, although she insisted (as always) on being left alone behind a locked door. Wishing to follow the argument more closely, a certain Dominican approached the door, where he discovered a convenient chink through which he could observe the room. What he saw was Sybil staging this remarkable colloquy by herself, while making the bed. The clerics broke down the door and discovered her many props, along with the food under her bed. Sybil's bid for attention created a huge scandal. The mob wanted her put to death; the local Beguines wept, covering their faces and fleeing for shame. Even the bishop, who had, after all, looked particularly foolish, wanted her put to death, although he eventually yielded to "saner counsel." He settled for having Sybil imprisoned on a bread-and-water diet, where she soon died.

How does one explain Sybil's surprising, albeit temporary, success? She could certainly not have managed without the help of her "familiar priest," who supplied the paraphernalia to simulate the angelic presence and brought her food during the night to sustain her after her three-day raptures. (The priest told her hosts to ignore any noise they might hear: it was only the demons.) But time was also on Sybil's side. Richer, writing between 1254 and 1264, implies that Sybil's bid for sanctity was more or less concurrent with the heretical purge of Robert le Bougre, who was active between 1233 and 1239.52 Robert was one of the earliest papal inquisitors, whose methods were no more systematic, and no less ruthless, than were those of his contemporary Conrad of Marburg. Hence the papal inquisition was still in its infancy, and the dissemination of inquisitional procedure in its various guises was just beginning.

This is not to say that the clerics involved were entirely bovine and instantly willing to credit the authenticity of Sybil's flamboyant mystical experiences. We are told that both the Franciscans and the Dominicans came to observe her but were never able to catch her at her game. Like-wise, the bishop and his entourage, "wishing to test if it was so that she would not eat or drink and if she were rapt in spirit, as she said, had Sybil transferred into another house."[53] It was a good plan, but they were ultimately outmaneuvered by Sybil. After remaining there for three days simulating rapture and starving herself, Sybil could stand it no longer. She told the bishop that if she remained in that locale, demons would tear her to pieces. The bishop—

concerned, credulous, perhaps unschooled in undertaking a systematic examination, but clearly incapable of exerting the kind of pressure that would secure the evidence he sought—relented and had the wily woman carried back to her former abode. There were no more tests after this, and Sybil, becoming progressively more brazen, went on to commission her hairy demon suit.

Over time, procedures for monitoring the public claims of an alleged living saint seem to have been elaborated, as indicated in descriptions of Magdalena Beutler's mystical death of 1431.54 The incident is given particular attention in Nider's *Formicarium*, receiving pride of place among his lively parade of bogus female mystics.[55] According to his account, Magdalena was a Clarissan nun of Freiburg who was prone to lengthy raptures. On one memorable occasion, she disappeared for three days, during which time it was alleged that she had been raptured not only in soul but also in body. Nider adds that either this was the literal truth or she had hidden herself for the stipulated period, since she was not discovered during the ensuing search.[56] In any case, she eventually returned with a celestial page of parchment detailing how the nuns should reform themselves to avert divine vengeance. The nuns gave up their illicit personal effects, vengeance was averted, and her reputation for prophecy spread throughout the country. And then on Christmas Day, she received a new and startling message, which she took pains to broadcast: on a certain date (which Magdalena specified) around the feast of the Epiphany, she would die corporeally and migrate from the world. The devoted nuns believed Magdalena and followed her directions for the funeral to the letter. A newly painted sarcophagus was prepared, a great many candles were ordered, and the news of the event flew not only around Constance but through the adjacent dioceses of Strasbourg and Basel. Some believed, others doubted, but a huge multitude assembled from every rank, both clerical and lay. Nider, whose monastery in Basel was only a day's journey from Constance, thought the situation deserved monitoring and decided to send the monastery's procurator to testify to the events. The men of the city council, moreover, prudently sent suitable witnesses and their own physician.57We know from another source that, in addition to the men named by Nider, the dignitaries in attendance included the count, the deacons from Freiburg and Rheinfelden, the head of the school for the Augustinians, the priors of the Carthusians of Basel and Freiburg respectively, the mayor and his predecessor, and the most important city councillors.[58]

> Therefore with all the sisters standing around in the choir that morning and the said men, and many other mature ecclesiastics and regulars, and with the plebs outside the church expecting a great prodigy, Sister Magdalena came and inclined her head on the breast of a certain sister, immediately showed that she

> was rapt in ecstasy, whether truly or in pretense, and thus lay for some time sufficiently immobile. And when certain women doubted whether she was dead or alive, the doctor publicly touching her pulse announced that life was present. Nevertheless she sent forth a certain voice, no longer virginal as earlier, but somewhat coarse, saying: To the sarcophagus.[59]

After a seemly period of repose, Magdalena got up from her sarcophagus and asked for food. A few believed that she had died, but the majority remained unconvinced. While some of the skeptics were prepared to laugh at their own gullibility, most were angry and created a disturbance in the monastery.

A hoarseness of voice is one of the symptoms of demonic possession, at least according to William of Auvergne.[60] But the fact that Magdalena is described as retaining her pulse throughout her rapture, nevertheless appearing to believe in her own "death," would suggest that Nider thought she was the victim of a *phantastica luminaria*—an imaginary illumination, something he describes as more dangerous than demonic possession.[61] That Magdalena was still alive eight years after the event further undermines her credibility, at least from Nider's perspective.[62] Nider concludes his account by alluding to a similar instance of predicted death that failed to materialize, this time by a Beguine in Poland, which created a similar tumult among the disillusioned.[63]

Of course, it is possible that Nider misunderstood the event, and that Magdalena's motives were less entrepreneurial than one might at first imagine. Catherine of Siena experienced a mystical death, which her confessor, Raymond of Capua, portrayed as an actual physical passing that endured for four hours and was witnessed by the women in the community. In the heterodox Beguine treatise *Schwester Katrei*, a three-day mystical death is described as an essential stage in the movement toward a permanent union with God.[64] (And three days was also the magic number for Sybil's raptures, during which time she barely breathed.) We further learn from Magdalena's vita that, as with Christina Mirabilis, this was not the first time Magdalena had "died." She also had, apparently, expired as a child and was already in her grave-clothes when her mother besought God to bring her daughter back, promising to dedicate her to the monastic life. Magdalena was also prone to spells of such profound catalepsy that she was several times taken for dead. Perhaps "death" in Magdalena's lexicon was a relatively temporary state.[65] Yet there was an anomalous vita of Magdalena in existence long *before* her death, a vita in which she probably collaborated and which explicitly refers to her as saintly (*heiligmaessig*). This seems to indicate a level of hubris that is not easy to reconcile with holy humility.[66] But whatever inspiration may have guided Magdalena's behavior, the event she staged did not pass muster with current standards of proof.

Our third and final instance of potential fraud occurred in Narbonne in 1288. It involves a certain matron named Rixendis, whose pious claims generated sufficient suspicion to justify an episcopal inquisition. The bishopric was vacant at the time, so the inquest was conducted by the archbishop's *officialis*, the canon lawyer Lenterius, in conjunction with the cathedral chapter. Rixendis seems to have initially attracted unfavorable attention to herself by making a public statement concerning theWaldensians, although the fragmentary nature of the source gives no clear indication of what this statement might have been. But the major thrust of the inquiry focuses on her visionary and cultic claims. According to Rixendis's testimony, eight years had passed since the onset of her raptures. Some of these ecstasies were of a celestial nature, during which experiences she met with certain heavenly luminaries (Christ, his mother, and Saint Francis); others involved purgatorial visions, during which she encountered various relatives. She was assured by her parents of her successful intervention on behalf of many souls in purgatory, an assurance borne out by the gratifying sight of her parents being admitted into heaven. But their admission occurred only after a brief sojourn at Rixendis's home, which seems to have functioned as a halfway house between purgatory and paradise for the many souls Rixendis helped to free.[67] In the midst of describing this vision to her judges, Rixendis went into what they took to be a feigned rapture (*fingebat se raptam*) and would no longer answer questions.[68] But as the record says, it was time to eat and the inquest was adjourned until the next day.

On the morrow, discoveries about Rixendis came in thick and fast. During one of her raptures, a celestial voice dictated a letter from Saint John (whether the Baptist or the Evangelist is not clear) containing a set of rather banal requirements: no fires were to be lit on Sunday, nothing was to be bought or sold, nor was any hot food to be prepared or consumed. According to the defendant's testimony, however, a number of women were in attendance at the time of this rapture, all of whom she claims could likewise testify to having heard the voice. Her rapture also seems to have stimulated considerable commotion in the heavens, since many lights began to fall from the sky, while a certain star came to rest above her house. When asked whether she had the capacity to work miracles, Rixendis affirmed that she could, describing how she made the sign of the cross over a blind woman: the latter's sight was partially restored so that she could see beds, chests, and open windows with one eye, and things that were shut with the other.[69] Apparently Rixendis had at one point given birth to an illegitimate child. Although asked repeatedly, Rixendis would not reveal the name of the father: "she said she had confessed

this to her confessor, and since the lords who sought and inquired of her were not her confessors, she was not bound to reveal this to them." (While technically true, this was hardly a very judicious answer.) Rixendis further maintained that she had been apprised ahead of time of her summons before the archepiscopal court by a voice, which urged her to rise up and speak the truth. (Many people were apparently present to hear the voice, which spoke to Rixendis a number of times, addressing her in the most flattering terms as "Truth," "Goodness," and "Sanctity.") She was also supernaturally informed that had her persecutors attempted to wrest her forcibly from her bed, not only would they have been thwarted in their attempts; they would have been damned as a result. Her voluntary rising to answer the inquisitors' summons, however, would "confirm her in Christ and the martyrs in strength, as much as to her persecutors."[70]

At that point the court decided to interrogate the "many women who were said to have had access to Rixendis and to adhere to the errors of that Rixendis." But the first witness mentioned is a certain Caihanus, indicating that her following was by no means exclusively female. Caihanus's testimony suggests that Rixendis's pretensions had impinged upon local credulity in other alarming ways. He relates how, at the request of her followers, Rixendis extended her arms and raised her hands to bless them. Calling her son, she placed her hands on his head, saying, "Igive thanks for you . . . Be worthy of thanks, and then saying to those standing around: God yet may do great things through him."[71] Caihanus himself asserted that he had become disenchanted with Rixendis and her claims. But he had seen others abase themselves before her. Even so, Caihanus had assisted in feeding Rixendis, who was weakened in the course of a rapture, dividing her bread up and helping her to drink through a straw.

Rixendis's pretensions are a pastiche of the various pious contentions that characterized the women discussed thus far. Her negotiations in purgatory seem indebted to Beguine spirituality. The celestial letter, which also figured prominently in Magdalena Beutler's life, was a common trope among visionaries.[72] The need for assisted feeding suggests that Rixendis likewise experienced long and enervating raptures, as did Elisabeth of Spalbeek (or as were simulated by the bogus Beguine, Sybil). Caihanus was granted the signal privilege of feeding Rixendis after her raptures, a favor also extended to a member of Philip of Clairvaux's retinue with respect to Elisabeth. One also gleans from other testimony that the two mystics used the same terms of endearment for Christ. Bent over her devotional picture of the crucifixion, Elisabeth would repeat, "Lord, Sweet Lord," in her Flemish dialect, for which Philip provides the

Latin ("*Here, soete Here*, id est, *Domine, dulcis Domine*"). Rixendis would similarly call upon her "Sweet Lord" in a variety of ways in a French dialect ("*Dus Diaus, Dus Jhesus, Bon Jhesus, Dus Jhesus, etc*."). [73] Moreover, Rixendis traded on the mystery of her illegitimate son the same way that the followers of Elena d'Oglio or Guglielma had capitalized on their respective favorite's mysterious origins. Along with other victims of ecclesiastical inquisitors, Rixendis assimilated her persecutions with those experienced by Christ and the martyrs. But like the Guglielmites (and perhaps Guglielma herself), Rixendis aimed high, attempting to establish herself within an exalted soteriological framework. A star shone over her house, and she alluded to her son's great destiny, thereby attempting to excite messianic expectations. From this perspective, the fact that Rixendis arrogated church authority by developing a personal computation of Easter becomes particularly suggestive. [74]

And yet in all probability Rixendis was no fraud, differing in this respect from the deliberately self-aggrandizing Sybil. Rixendis evidently believed her claims. Indeed, the delusional nature of her beliefs ironically attests to her integrity. Her judges seem gradually to have become aware of these considerations over the course of the inquest. On the first day, the judges presumed that Rixendis was feigning rapture as a ruse that simultaneously proffered evidence of her mystical gifts and permitted her to evade questioning. But by the second day, the inquisitors' attitude necessarily changed: not only had Rixendis claimed to hear heavenly voices, but she was convinced that others could hear them as well; she thought that she was instrumental in effecting a cometstorm, while a residual star hovered over her house; she was guileless enough to allege that the celestial voice addressed her as "Truth," "Goodness," and "Sanctity." At this point, her examiners seem to have decided that they had heard enough from Rixendis, and quickly reoriented themselves to address matters of damage control, assessing the full extent of Rixendis's following. And, in fact, Rixendis may not ultimately have been tried for heresy; rather, her case is rubricated as "Inquisition on the fanatical Rixendis" (*Inquisitio in Rixendin fanaticam*), the adjective *fanatica* not only designating religious enthusiasm, but also meaning "furious, mad"—suggestive of mental imbalance. Rixendis's mental instability would probably spare her being interrogated and condemned as a heretic. Of course, we have seen that many inquisitors perceived insanity as a heretical stratagem for evading the stake, and we have heard inquisitors, such as Bernard Gui, complaining about this ploy. [75] But judging from the later line of questioning adopted, the examiners had ample proof that Rixendis was mentally ill.

Yet even if we assume that Rixendis's putative madness made a

difference to her judges, her mental state had not necessarily registered with her devotees in the same way. They may not have been aware of Rixendis's assumption that her followers heard and saw as she did. Or if they did know, it clearly did not make a significant difference to them. In short, if the ability to establish a following is the marker, the madwoman was every bit as dangerous as the cynical operator, as was an individual of genuine inspiration.

DISINTEGRATING PROOF: THE PATHOLOGIZATION OF FEMALE SPIRITUALITY

> Later, the visual and auditory illusions became much more frequent. . . . The patient was so much preoccupied
>
> with these pathological experiences that he was inaccessible to any other impression and would sit perfectly
>
> rigid and motionless for hours (hallucinatory stupor). . . . His delusional ideas gradually assumed
>
> a mystical and religious character; he was in direct communication with God, he was the plaything of
>
> the devil, he saw "miraculous apparitions," he heard "holy music," and in the end he even came to believe that he was living in another world.

(Sigmund Freud, *Psycho-analytic Notes on an Autobiographical Account of a Case of Paranoia [Dementia Paranoides]*)[76]

The symptoms experienced by the unfortunate German politician Schreber, Freud's case of *dementia paranoides*, bear some striking similarities to aspects of the medieval mystical union with God. Schreber's expectations tended to be more literal, however: he believed that his visions anticipated his metamorphosis into a woman, preparing him for sexual union with his creator. Yet as idiosyncratic as Schreber's expectations might be, Freud's analysis is consistent with a long tradition of pathologizing mystical experiences that reaches back to the High Middle Ages. Already in the thirteenth century, Rixendis's apparent mental instability was an open invitation to the burgeoning diagnostic skills of the period. Corresponding to the process of canonization's increased dependency on medical expertise, there was also a progressive awareness that equal care should be taken over a living person's claims to supernatural privilege. Moreover, with works like Avicenna's *Canon of Medicine* or Aristotle's writings on natural science as standard university fare, theologians had more than a smattering of knowledge touching medicine and biology that they were only too willing to wield. Thus one of the analogies employed by the anonymous Franciscan in the course of his argument in favor of the superiority of stigmata to martyrdom was

Avicenna's claim that a hen who bested a rooster would accordingly grow spurs.[77] Interestingly, in the laterMiddle Ages there are numerous instances in which doctors will go on to seek a higher degree in theology—a phenomenon that peaked in the second half of the fourteenth century—and such individuals were already attending lectures in theology before completing their medical degree.[78] Theology's diagnostic proclivity would culminate with the flourishing of treatises on spiritual discernment in the later Middle Ages, discussed in the next chapter. But such efforts were almost immediately apparent with the thirteenth century's concurrent rise of both scholasticism and mysticism.

Most theologians were generally prepared to grant that women were more likely than men to be the recipients of supernatural phenomena such as visions or the stigmata, and assigned solid physiological reasons for this predisposition.According to the prevailing Galenic theory of humors, women were held to be colder and wetter than men. From a physiological standpoint, the combination of heat and dryness, which characterized the male, was more highly esteemed. And yet the very qualities that marked women as physically inferior to men would simultaneously distinguish them as more receptive to supernatural influences. Women's greater humidity, and thus greater softness, made them literally and figurativelymore impressionable—a quality that also helped to explain their heightened imaginative faculty. The power of the female imagination, in conjunction with its impressionability, is apparent in various theories of conception. It was widely believed that a fetus could resemble aspects of whatever or whomever the mother had beheld at the time of conception. One popular exemplum even went so far as to allege that a woman was freed from suspicions of adultery when it was determined that the child resembled the bedspread from the night of conception.[80] On a continuum with this view, the thirteenth-century encyclopedist Vincent of Beauvais enlisted Augustine's provocative suggestion that love or desire vehemently affects the entire being, likening the potential impact of these emotions to the changes that occur in the body of a chameleon. Augustine associates the chameleon's mind-body symbiosis with the mother and fetus—the latter will naturally absorb the mother's desires (*libidines*) and fantasies (*phantasia*).[81] In the richly physical milieu of late medieval spirituality, this doctrine's potential for naturalizing the supernatural is immense. Eventually Pietro Pompanazzi (d. 1525), in the course of his discussion on how the activities of the emotions or the imagination impose themselves on the body, will even raise the possibility of the stigmata's being naturally imprinted on a fetus by the meditation of the pregnant mother. As the author is aware, this proposition casts potential doubt not only on the

miraculous nature of how “the passion of our Lord Savior is fashioned in the human hearts” of various women, but even on the stigmata of Saint Francis.[82]

But the conditions facilitating the spiritual benefits associated with female physiology were inseparable from attendant dangers. This was already clear in the writings of William of Auvergne (d. 1249), the first scholastic to treat the spiritual ramifications of physiology extensively and, thus, a mainstay for future theologians with a diagnostic bent.83 William believed that a person’s humoral makeup —that is to say, complexion—informed his or her spiritual aptitude. Certain complexions actually engorge the soul, impeding its higher powers. Thus he cites Galen as saying that the phlegmatic complexion was particularly unspiritual. Following Aristotle,William maintains that a person possessed of a melancholic complexion was generally considered to be more intelligent and naturally predisposed to the kind of contemplation that could lend itself to mystical rapture.84Women, considered intellectually inferior to men, were unlikely candidates for a genuinely melancholic complexion, while their cool wetness would recommend them as potential phlegmatics.[85] Nevertheless, other aspects of their physiology made them prone to both mystical rapture and conditions that could masquerade as such.86William’s disparagement of certain superstitious beliefs perpetuated by old women, for example, takes the following turn:

> You ought, however, to know about these things which you heard, that many of these visions and fantastic apparitions are produced in many people by the illness of melancholia. This is especially true with women, just as is the case with true visions and revelations. And the reason is, in addition to what the doctors say, the nature of female souls— namely, from the fact that they are far easier of impression than male souls.[87]

Thus in contradistinction to a genuinely melancholic complexion, the disease of melancholia to which William alludes resulted from a humoral imbalance, in particular an excess of black bile, which could, in turn, give rise to counterfeit raptures.[88] William, however, confuses the matter still more when he cites Galen as witness to the way that certain individuals, from the vehemence of their devotions and their ardent desire to enjoy the beauty of God, will develop melancholia. The symptoms are especially deceptive in that, at least initially, someone afflicted with melancholia will experience great illuminations. All too soon, however, that light is dramatically shut off as corrupted vapors reach the mind, provoking alienation and delirium.[89] Moreover, according to theorists like Albert the Great

(d.1280), female humidity results in a more "mobile" complexion, which not only hampers the intellect but fosters mutability and a desire for novelty.[90] This kind of physiological fault would tend to make women all the more eager for, and credulous of, outlandish otherworldly experiences.

Finally, there is that peculiarly female disease known as the suffocation of the uterus, or hysteria, wherein the absence of sex permits corrupted humors to build up so that the womb actually rises and presses against the heart.[91] This condition could also, in turn, induce a kind of abstraction. The Pseudo-Albert the Great's *On the Secrets of Women* relates how Galen cured one woman who, judging from her total immovability, which seemed to include a loss of pulse, was given up for dead.[92] One of the commentators on this text draws explicit parallels with suspect spirituality:

> Women who suffer this illness lie down as if they were dead. Old women who have recovered from it say that it was caused by an ecstasy during which they were snatched out of their bodies and borne to heaven or to hell, but this is ridiculous. The illness happens from natural causes, however they think that they have been snatched out of their bodies because vapors rise to the brain. If these vapors are very thick and cloudy, it appears to them that they are in hell and they see black demons; if the vapors are light, it seems to them that they are in heaven and that they see God and his angels shining brightly.[93]

Even Thomas of Cantimpré, no mean skeptic about the supernatural origin of trances or the efficacy of female mysticism, states that "this disease especially occurs with widows, and whenever this occurs they fall [to the ground] just as with heart disease."[94]

With respect to positive spiritual potential, women's heightened powers of imagination were likewise beset with an ambivalence that parallels the advantages and disadvantages of the female physiology generally. On the one hand, a heightened imagination was undoubtedly an advantage from the point of view of contemporary spirituality and its emphasis on visualizing key events in Christ's life. Most of the female mystics of the period received their revelations through the medium of spiritual vision, which relied on mental images derived from the imagination.[95] On the other hand, the imagination itself drew upon corporeal vision for its images; thus it was the mental faculty that was most likely to be tainted by contact with the senses.[96] Indeed, a number of authorities perceived the imagination to be as much a physical power as a mental one.[97] Moreover, the imagination itself was the part of the mind that was particularly susceptible to

demonic vitiation. Hence Vincent of Beauvais describes the manner in which demons can penetrate the imagination, riding the crest of the humors and impressing various fallacious images therein.[98]

Demons also held sway over the passions, a term that in the Middle Ages designated an emotional state produced by a combined set of psychological and corporeal factors that would, in turn, render solid physiological consequences.[99] William of Auvergne gives a detailed description of how the devil, pressing himself on a certain organ, produces a passion so powerful that physical seizures can follow, and excoriates certain medical experts who assign a purely physical origin to such disorders. He relays compelling delusions that can ensue as a result of such diabolical pressures. One man believed himself to be a rooster and spoke in what he took to be a rooster voice. Another thought himself a bird each time one flew by. This latter delusion possessed no particular monopoly, however, since on other occasions the individual in question alternately believed he was the son of God, the Holy Spirit, the son of the devil, and the Antichrist. William also knew a woman "who believed herself to be known from inside by the devil and she said that she felt other scarcely credible things." Demonic pressure on one man's imaginative organ resulted in a complete stupor, during which the unconscious man was convinced he was a wolf ravaging the countryside. (It did not help matters that the devil actually produced a wolf that did ravage the countryside, which the deluded man perceived as corroborating evidence of the harm he had wrought during his metamorphosis.)[100]

Certain passions, particularly fleshly concupiscence, existed in opposition to the spiritual life and thus forestalled mystical rapture.[101] And yet even such antithetical conditions produced symptoms that were open to misinterpretation. Extreme carnal love, for example, was believed to induce a complete abstraction from the senses—symptomatic of the famous medieval lovesickness, a condition associated with melancholia.[102] More-in over, a widely held understanding of mystical rapture is that the soul is literally seized by divine love.[103] William of Auvergne would contend, however, that this overinvestment in carnal desire results in the opposite of mystical rapture.[104] Even so, viewed from the outside, the two conditions were indistinguishable.

Illness, madness, or brain damage could also simulate a rapturelike state.[105] A certain good and religious man told William of Auvergne how, in the course of an illness, he was convinced that he saw great towers with black men ascending them. William is further aware of how the devil might capitalize on the delirium ensuing from such illness, tampering with the imagination and producing delusions of grandeur.[106] Sometimes people in the grip of an illness can

temporarily speak with such sublimity that they appear prophetic. Eventually, however, the telltale fumes would rise to the brain and the momentary lucidity would devolve into ridiculous babble. According to Vincent of Beauvais, the soul of a sick person, when in a state of abstraction from the body, continues restlessly to manufacture images. The invalid is incapable of discerning between the images apprehended by the corporeal eye and those present to spiritual vision. In other words, the imaginary is mistaken for the real and vice versa. But the devil can also produce these same effects in individuals who are otherwise healthy, giving rise to demoniacs and false prophets.[107]

The above discussion certainly problematizes the illnesses that were so frequently employed to prove female sanctity, since any number of symptoms of ill-health could undermine the different order of proof required for the authentication of a rapture. For instance, James of Vitry mentions in passing the fact that Mary of Oignies's weak heart permitted her to fall into an ecstasy at a mere mention of the passion. Caesarius of

Heisterbach relates that Elisabeth of Scho ö nau usually suffered from heart trouble (*passionem cordis*) but would be relieved of her pain in the course of an ecstasy.[108] In the early thirteenth century, such assertions seemed largely unproblematical ways of authenticating divine favor. Indeed, the rubric for Caesarius's exemplum concerning Elisabeth is "Contemplation exceeding reason is in a certain way the death of the flesh"—hence the story was used to demonstrate the miraculous death-in-life condition of rapture. If assessed according to the progressively medicalized standard of the later Middle Ages, however, Caesarius's miraculous proof worked to precisely the opposite effect, tending to naturalize the marvel in question. An appreciation of the tension between these different criteria helps to contextualize the line of questioning pursued in Clare of Montefalco's process of canonization. After testifying to Clare's raptures, various nuns in the community were immediately asked whether Clare suffered from any gynecological problems (*de infirmitate matricis*), heart condition, or epilepsy—all of which could provoke the kind of unconscious state that might be mistaken for rapture. Fortunately, Clare had never been prone to these particular ailments.[109] As the Middle Ages progressed, ecclesiastical authorities became increasingly sensitive to the dangers of physiologically induced pseudoraptures, and the fortunes of female spirituality would dwindle proportionately. Indeed, later writers, such as John Nider and Bernard Basin, demonstrate that such physiological considerations prepared the way for a gendered explanation of witchcraft.[110]

CONFESSION, "THE HABIT OF GOOD MINDS," AND THE RISE OF SCRUPULOSITY

It is the habit of good minds to see a fault
where there is none.
(Gregory the Great)
Who doubts in faith is an infidel.
(Raymond of PeÑafort)[111]

Of course, the surest way to secure one's mystical experiences against the whims of the pathologizing clergy was still to retain one's own interpretive strategist—usually a confessor, the more highly placed the better. Indeed, women's scrupulous confessional practices, reified by their ongoing dependence on the confessional relationship, cast deviations into sharp relief, again indicating the uncomfortable proximity of the different confessional fora. Consider, for example, the well-known case of the mystic Marguerite Porete. Her indifference to presenting herself in the context of some recognizable confessional relationship—whether in terms of a stable confessional practice or of a confessor to vet and record her revelations—ultimately meant that she would end up at a different confessional locus altogether: an inquisitional tribunal. The cleric Guiard de Cressonessart attempted to defend Marguerite before this dire forum, thus providing her with some clerical cover. But there is no mention of her welcoming his overtures: it is doubtful that she had even met him before.[112]

And yet a rising pastoral discourse would again appeal to medicine in order to undermine the efficacy of women's confessional practices, this erstwhile bastion of female exemplarity, hence eroding the relationship on which women depended not only for spiritual nourishment but often for physical safety. Certain ecclesiastical authorities gradually came to believe it possible for an overexacting penitent to sink too deeply into the sacrament, inadvertently crossing a subtle barrier beyond which a virtue is deformed into a vice. We can already see the potential for this type of mutation in the thirteenth century, when theologians, such as Aquinas, will apply themselves to Gregory the Great's characterization of the "habit of good minds to recognize a sin where there is none" by asking whether someone could go so far as to confess a sin that he or she had not really committed, concluding that this was impermissible.[113] John Gerson (d. 1429), chancellor of the University of Paris and one of the most important voices in the pastoral theology of his day, will extend and deepen this problematization of confessional practice under the rubric of scrupulosity or pusillanimity.[114]

Gerson's general approach to spiritual dispositions is encapsulated

in a statement he attributes to Plato: “Souls follow bodies”—a tendency that Gerson saw as not invariable but definitely indicative of a certain inclination. Here the blood was the medium through which psychological and spiritual inclinations were fashioned and transmitted.[115] Gerson’s discussion of scrupulosity is grounded in the premise that fear is a passion, and that someone predisposed to this passion is especially prone to suffer from scrupulosity of conscience.[116] Complexion was a further contributing factor. If a person had thin, cold blood, and his or her natural moisture was dominated by phlegmatic humors—characteristics that were thought to be typical of women—that individual would be prone to fear and pusillanimity, responses that were frequently associated with a weakness of the heart.[117] And these complexional traits were open to demonic exploitation. Indeed, both good and bad angels are capable of penetrating the lower, sensual part of the soul, thus affecting both the senses and the sensual appetites.118With God’s permission, the devil can take advantage of the timid person’s defective nature by incubating the passion of fear in the senses. People who are particularly afflicted might become stupefied with fear, break out in cold sweats, or fall to the ground as if mad. More-over, if these hapless individuals permit themselves to be overcome by this fear even once or twice, chances are that they will never be cured—a truth to which physicians themselves will attest, or so Gerson maintains.[119] Such fear should thus be fled rather than embraced.[120]

From Gerson’s perspective, a classic case of needless scrupulosity is an individual’s concern about insufficient attention during prayers—something that, to Gerson’s mind, is perfectly understandable, and hence excusable, considering human frailty. Such individuals who “by accident have excessively fluid fantasies [*fluxibiles nimis habent phantasias*] due to infirmity and are distracted willynilly from their purpose by a light breeze of wind to other things” are not in any way culpable.[121] Then there are those who think themselves insufficiently contrite, “who tire themselves and their confessors out with their reiterations of confessions—especially over light sins of little weight.”[122] Gerson is constantly reminding penitents of this sort, burdened with so exquisite a degree of fearfulness, that their very scrupulosity puts divine clemency and even grace in doubt. Of course, what is also at issue is the priest’s power of absolution.[123]

But there are other dangers implicit in scrupulosity that were more costly than either the penitent’s niggling self-torture or the confessor’s exasperation. The impulse to confess every sinful or potentially blasphemous thought could have the effect of reinforcing the thought and possibly occasioning a new sin.[124] Gerson alludes to this danger by evoking one of his favorite biblical tags: “He that violently bloweth

his nose, bringeth out blood (Prov. 30.33)."[125] Even more alarming ramifications ensue if an individual manages to convince him-or herself that a morally neutral act is sinful, or that a venial sin is a mortal sin—a dilemma discussed under the rubric of erroneous conscience. Such convictions become self-fulfilling prophecies since the conscience constitutes a tribunal unto itself. This view is in keeping with the oftcited gloss on Rom. 14.23: whoever acts against conscience strengthens hell (*aedificat ad gehennam*), a phrase that Gerson puts to good use.[126] In other words, dictates of the conscience, even an erroneous conscience, were morally binding. Thus if you were convinced that something was sinful but went ahead and did it anyway, you would have sinned, even if you had been mistaken about its sinful status in the first place.[127]

The serious consequences of an erroneous conscience are but one aspect of the legacy of intentionality, which locates sin in the intention as opposed to the actual act, and Gerson relentlessly hammers home its implications. To intend a mortal sin is the same as committing one. To expose oneself to the peril of a mortal sin constitutes, in itself, a mortal sin, as does committing any potentially sinful act when the perpetrator is unsure of its moral status. But in contradistinction to the principles informing intentionality, Gerson maintains that ignorance of the law is no excuse, at least in the external forum, although he is prepared to concede that such ignorance may well exculpate one before God.[128] Hence Gerson stresses repeatedly the necessity for an individual to know the difference between venial and mortal sins—the best way to avoid the pitfalls of an erroneous conscience.[129] Otherwise, once an erroneous conscience has taken hold, the only solution would be for the afflicted individual to "depose" his or her conscience—that is to say, put aside or diffuse this fallacious level of conviction so that its power is diminished and no longer binding.[130] (This standard recommendation was, however, extremely difficult to enact since, as MichaudQuantin has noted, no one had ever come up with a formula for discerning erroneous conscience in the first place—not even Augustine, try as he might.)[131] Thus while Gerson is by no means oblivious to the potential good inherent in a fearful disposition, and cites Gregory's "habit of good minds" to this end, his citation is nevertheless set amid the constraints of erroneous conscience. A person possessing this "habit of good minds" must take care against "fall[ing] into the Scylla, wishing to avoid Charybdis."[132]

This new, somewhat wary, approach to confession, which will naturally take its toll on female spirituality, is a powerful indicator of changing times. While the scrupulosity of the Beguine milieu had been an important prop in promoting the sacrament of confession, by

Gerson's time it had outlived its usefulness. In fact, this same trait was even seen as undermining the sacrament. Mary of Oignies's "habit of good minds" as described by James of Vitry was illustrated by precisely the kind of sorrow over the commission of a venial sin that Gerson would target as suspect. The confessional profile of Mary's contemporary Lutgard of Aywie`res was even more vexed, at least when regarded through a late medieval lens. Not only was insufficient attention over the saying of her hours a constant concern for Lutgard, but this anxiety was not restricted to her own religious practice. She also (correctly) predicted a plague among the nuns who served in the infirmary of her community for their similar inattention. 133 Lutgard's fears for herself were eventually assuaged, not through confession and absolution, but through the mysterious arrival of a shepherd from afar who reassured her, in the presence of her entire community, that she was pleasing to God.[134]

Already in Gerson we find a predisposition to be especially concerned with scrupulosity in women. This is implicit in his diagnostic description of the fearful person as cold, wet, and phlegmatic. In a confessional context, moreover, Gerson is only too aware that female scrupulosity increases the contact between confessor and penitent, enhancing the chances of a gradual devolution from spiritual into carnal love. Thus he warns against the scruples that might arise in the course of meditation which inspire a person to seek counsel, especially a woman to seek counsel from a man. Such consultations would become habitual. The devil would gradually effect "a certain gluing together of souls" (*agglutinatio quae-dam animarum*) cloaked by a fictive spiritual love until finally "what isbegun in the spirit is consummated in the flesh."[135] This slow seduction is facilitated by the diabolical influence on the passions, an effect that Gerson claimed springs far worse traps than a mere whetting of the appetite by enticing the senses toward illicit things. "Indeed, I believe that the evil angel is able to remove [the passions] in a person, while he hopes through this that he can deceive the person more perilously and lead him to worse evils." Thus the individual experiences a simulated spiritual tranquillity and sweetness, gaining false confidence, only to fall miserably as a result. 136 It is no surprise that Gerson pragmatically gives the woman the right to confess elsewhere in the event that she anticipates sexual overtures from the priest in question—a decision she can effect unilaterally should he not be prepared to accord consent.[137]

In short, Gerson created a framework for stigmatizing and even pathologizing scrupulosity. Yet he seems to have shrunk from explicitly identifying this as a "woman's problem"—perhaps because he, by his own admission, was prone to this defect. Thus in a letter

justifying his temporary abandonment of the post of chancellor, he describes himself as “full of scruples and fear, most easily upset, so that Icontinually mull over something more than a thousand times.”[138] But others, not sharing Gerson’s scruples, would almost immediately move in and conclusively gender this pathology as female. This was notably true of John Nider, who was deeply indebted to the work of “the Chancellor,” as he respectfully referred to Gerson. When reviewing the reasons for excessive scrupulosity in his *Consolation of a Timorous Conscience*, Nider leads off with a discussion of complexions.Women, particularly old women and individuals with a melancholic complexion, are highly susceptible owing to excessive coldness. In women especially, a certain constriction of the heart attends their fearfulness, and they frequently tremble, while the members attached to the heart are the more afflicted. The voice falters and the lips quaver, as is evident with respect to the woman with flux who fearfully approached Christ for healing (Mark 5.25), who is thus rendered as something of a type for scrupulosity. This association invites the resurfacing of a suppressed subtext for the entire issue of scrupulosity. For the original context of Gregory the Great’s “habit of good minds” was the question of whether a menstruating woman should be permitted to receive communion—a context withheld in James of Vitry’s later appropriation of this characterization in his panegyric of Mary of Oignies’s confessional habits. Although Nider does not invoke Gregory explicitly at this point, his analysis nevertheless unerringly rejoins scrupulosity with the flawed, bleeding, female body. Elsewhere, Nider will cite Albert the Great, who alleges that the combination of woman’s lack of heat and dominant moisture “into which terrible things are poured” renders her naturally fearful. In addition to this defect of the complexion, other factors, such as retention of corrupt menstrual blood, inordinate vigils, fasting, care, solitude, or deep thought, can also intrude to stimulate the disease of mania or melancholia, the main symptom of which is excessive fearfulness. Certain individuals—referred to as *energuimini* or, more conveniently still, lunatics—are affected by the movement of the moon, which manipulates the moisture in their heads, causing them to howl with fear. Demonic temptation can also wreak havoc with a healthy constitution, afflicting it with a black jaundice (*colera nigra*) likewise associated with fear.[139] When differentiating scrupulosity from the other passions, Nider makes the telling point that “it is that much more dangerous by the extent to which it is falsely reckoned a virtue.”[140] He will accordingly trim Gregory’s “habit of good minds” with Aquinas’s interpretation of “good” in terms of the perfection of justice.[141]

Nider’s *Consolation of a Timorous Conscience* presents scrupulosity as

a potentially lethal affliction, which could generate the life-threatening sin of despair.His colorful *Formicarium*, moreover, adduces data in support of this point. A nun from Nuremberg named Kunegond was in constant fear that her confession was insufficient, a concern that Nider describes as natural in the fragile sex. The inordinate fear that she had committed a mortal sin, compounded by excessive fasts, not only caused her confessors to be concerned for her sanity but actually delivered her to death's door. Fortunately, God effected a timely removal of the fear of damnation a mere three days before her death. The pious widow and prioress Catherine de Westhusen, afflicted by the identical concern, was likewise liberated under similar circumstances.[143] In the course of a routine confession, Nider's special sensitivity to the tenderness of the female conscience and the attendant dangers of scrupulosity facilitated his diagnosis of what ailed a young matron: she was irrationally convinced she was demonically possessed.[144]

SCRUPULOSITY AND HERETICAL INQUISITION

Nider's treatment of scrupulosity is informed by a particular agenda: like Gerson, he hoped to impose some constraints on a female spirituality that had, to his mind, gotten out of control. Thus Nider's characterization of scrupulosity as a woman's problem should be approached with caution. Even so, there is much in this characterization that resonates with what we have already seen. In the course of promoting confession as a sacrament, certain members of the clergy foregrounded women as ideal penitents—a characterization that had brought women visibility and a certain kind of power in the decades following Lateran IV. If one accepts the premise that women zealously embraced this penitential persona, was it possible that they *were* in danger of sinking too deeply into the sacrament so that their very advocacy for confession became dangerous to both themselves and others?

Dorothea of Montau's scrupulosity seems to be a case in point. The collection of her visions entitled the *Septililium*, divided between a detailed account of Dorothea's own confessional practices and disquisitions on confession by the visionary Christ, actually concludes with a miniature treatise on confession. In this context, "Christ" emerges as a relentlessly stern pedagogue, particularly inclined to find fault with his female penitents. Thus he critiques John of Marienwerder's blamable indulgence toward a woman who was insufficiently prepared for confession, arguing that she should have been dismissed preemptorily so as not to waste her confessor's time.[145] "A confessor . . . to an older person confessing unreasonably

and inexpeditiously ought not to be kind, but serious and rigid. Nor should he tolerate a person not knowing [what to confess] in confession, but he should harshly upbraid the negligence so that the person is confused and ashamed." Penitents who desire interrogation or instruction (which were, after all, primary purposes underlying the sacrament's institution) should be tersely told to go and hear a preacher. In short, "the confessor should conduct himself so that the sons and daughters of confession should not think that he has a good opinion of them and should be terrified to approach him."[146] Christ's subsequent indictment of a woman who accidentally smothered her child, presumably while sleeping in the same bed, is more intransigent still. Dorothea is instructed to reproach John for succumbing to the woman's entreaties and assigning only private penance for this publicly known crime. Assessing the penitent as insufficiently contrite, John was required to address her as follows: " 'Ah, you poor and wretched person, how can you, situated in such great tribulation, come to me so cold and barely contrite for sins so grave and horrible? . . . What happened to you is a great evil, to be lamented fully with heartfelt sadness from the depths of the heart. And I, if I were able, would gladly wish you to pour out tears of blood weeping.' When arguing these points with her, you ought to have appeared serious and impatient and to have shown bitterness in your gestures and words, and thus to have incited her to the heartfelt sorrow of penance."[147]

Thus Dorothea's heightened scrupulosity was not just internalized but seemingly projected onto other women as well—sometimes in an unsympathetic, even brutal way. This prompted her to look to the clergy to enact stringent disciplinary measures on both herself and others. One can imagine how this same reflex could trigger still more tangible effects: how the propensity for confession and accusation of self and others could result in the kind of incrimination that fostered the merging of the penitential forum with its harsher double, the inquisitional forum against heresy. 148 At this juncture, we should remind ourselves that, from a theological standpoint, even the confession of an unrepentant heretic was protected by the seal of confession. In theory, he or she could not be denounced by the confessor. Yet we have also seen how certain canonical authorities, in particular, Raymond of PeÑafort, believed that a heretic had relinquished the privilege of sacramental secrecy, and that his confessor should denounce him to the inquisition—a view that, however contested, would remain in circulation owing to the immense popularity of Raymond's manual for confessors.[149] Recall that Dorothea's confessions were perceived as sufficiently alarming that one of her confessors availed himself of Raymond's fiat. But the sacrament's capacity to incriminate a reformed heretic did not work in

reverse. A confessor might, according to some authorities, betray a penitent's confession and denounce him to the inquisitors, but his evidence concerning a penitent's confession and absolution from heresy would not vindicate a former heretic. Inquisitors were explicitly instructed to disregard the confessor's attestations of a penitent's absolution, perceiving the internal and external fora as discrete tribunals. Thus according to Zanchino Ugolino, a heresy carries with it a double punishment. Sacramental confession may vindicate you before God, and spare you the flames of hell, but it does not absolve you before the inquisitional tribunal or help you to evade its penalties. The power of reconciling heretics belongs to inquisitors and bishops alone.[150]

But female scrupulosity may even have dispensed with the need for clerical denunciations in some instances. Indeed, following the basic contours of William of Auvergne's juristic analogy for the sacrament of penance, the perfect penitent was simultaneously culprit, accuser, arraigner, and prosecutor of him-or herself.[151] Some women, acting in the spirit of Gregory's "habit of good minds," seem to have played a proactive role in their own prosecution. It is worth noting that in the primarily female heresy of the Guglielmites, for example, several women came forward without being summoned and confessed to the inquisition voluntarily, while none of the men did.[152] The testimony of the Na Prous Boneta (d. 1328), a sympathizer with the Beguins and an ardent devotee of Olivi, was seemingly shaped by the kind of preparation for confession advocated by the clergy, enabling the penitent to "vomit forth her virus" with ease—as Gerson would have it.[153] Her "confession," proffered without contrition or repentance, however, places her at the crossroads between the well-prepared penitent and the sacrificial witness at the center of a martyr's *passio*.[154]

Scrupulosity could also imperil women who were much less culpable. Stephen of Bourbon, a Dominican inquisitor who was active in France in the 1230s, tells of just such a case concerning a noblewoman in a city where he was conducting heresy trials. "Holy and innocent, she approached me saying that she offered herself to me for burning as a heretic worse than all the others who were burned for infidelity, as she was thinking the worst things about the articles of the faith and the sacraments." When the woman acknowledged that she never consented to these thoughts, he convinced her that she was innocent, and she left happy.[155] There is every reason to believe that the story of this nameless woman depicted not an isolated incident but something of a type. From this perspective, it is surely significant that Bernard Gui's inquisitional manual gives a sample sentence for someone who "incautiously and thoughtlessly" asserted that he or she

was a heretic, when, in fact, no heresy could be discerned.[156] A similar impulse may initially have determined the behavior of Constance of Rabastens (d. after 1386), one of the several female prophets who, anticipating Joan of Arc, arose during the papal schism. Constance was sufficiently concerned about the orthodoxy of her revelations that she submitted them to the inquisitor of Languedoc. She was ultimately imprisoned for her scrupulosity.[157]

An exemplary case from the Fournier register demonstrates how scrupulosity could spin a web of guilt and self-doubt that could trap and hold a woman in an agonized state of paralysis.[158] In 1318 Auda, a matron from the diocese of Pamiers, was summoned before inquisitor James Fournier, bishop of the region, under suspicion of heresy on the basis of her reported words of religious disaffection. Auda's problems had begun some years earlier (initially she said eight years before; later on she would emend this to four) when she was about seventeen or eighteen years of age and newly married. Because of some grave unspecified sin that she had committed before her marriage, she abstained from communion. When her abstinence aroused her husband's suspicions, however, she went ahead and received the sacrament anyway, although "she was altogether terrified and disturbed, because she received the body of Christ without confession of the said sin."[159] After this rash reception, Auda fell into a particular error whereby she could no longer believe that the consecrated bread and wine constituted the body of Christ. Initially Auda stated that this error had come upon her gradually, crystallizing a full three years after her pivotal infraction. But later, she again changed her testimony to claim that the error followed immediately upon her inappropriate participation in the sacrament.[160] Moreover, while her early testimony maintains that it was the precipitous reception of communion alone that brought on the crisis, a later emendation states that the immediate cause of her angst occurred when she was on her way to mass and heard about a woman who, unable to reach shelter, had been forced to give birth in the road. As a result, Auda kept imagining that the filth of after-birth had infected the body of Christ161—although Auda would later correct herself, denying that she ever actually thought that the host was infected by such filth, even though this shameful thought surfaced whenever the host was elevated. Moreover, not only could she no longer believe that the body of Christ was present on the altar; she could not even look upon it.[162]

Auda managed to keep her disaffection a secret from everyone, until she fell ill, at which point she told her husband, Guillelmus. The latter exclaimed, " 'Are you in your right senses, cursed woman?' " and threatened to send her away unless she confessed. Auda then

summoned her friend Ermengardis, who attempted to comfort the distraught invalid with devotional reassurances and accounts of eucharistic miracles.[163]

Under interrogation, Auda's husband Guillelmus said that he did not consider his wife a heretic but had always thought her a good Catholic —at least, up until her recent illness when she received communion. Upon being asked why he had not reported his wife's error to the bishop or inquisitor (a strangely phrased question, considering they were one and the same), Guillelmus claimed that his wife said many vain and horrible things during her sickness "just like a man or woman who spoke out of their minds." Moreover, she did, at his insistence, confess—hence he believed his reticence justified.[164]

Ermengardis's testimony basically corroborates the above statements. She adds, however, that, once she knew of Auda's error, she literally became sick with fear and, in the course of her infirmity, revealed Auda's condition to the priest, Guillelmus, "for the exoneration of Ermengardis, lest [this error] be in any way imputed to her, and she believed that the said priest revealed the aforesaid things to the said bishop."[165] The next person to be questioned was Guillelmus himself, who stipulated that he first learned of Auda's error in the course of Ermengardis's confession. Rather than breaking the seal of confession, however, Guillelmus concocted an ingenious strategy for evading its strictures. After congratulating Ermengardis for unburdening her conscience to God, Guillelmus urged the expediency of making some sort of declaration before others. Ermengardis agreed, in essence conceding the necessity of her friend's being denounced to the inquisitor. Thereupon Guillelmus summoned four men, including the son of the said Ermengardis, clearly garnering witnesses who could simultaneously exonerate Ermengardis and incriminate Auda.[166]

But even without Ermengardis's anxiety over being implicated in heresy by association, or her confessor's efforts to maneuver around the seal of confession, Auda's scrupulosity would doubtless have attracted official notice eventually. For Auda, whose many emendations of her statement are extremely indicative of her excruciating attention to matters of conscience, was constantly searching her memory in order to fine-tune her testimony. (There were six emendations in all, two of which occurred on the same day.) Thus she soon remembered other individuals with whom she had shared her doubts. For instance, Auda had revealed her concerns to Aladaycis, the nurse hired to attend Auda's son during her illness, as well as two of the nurse's friends, alleging that "she could not believe in God." The shocked women urged her to return to God.[167]

Bishop Fournier's diligence proved to be fully equal to the ever

expanding ambit of Auda's scrupulosity. He immediately acted upon Auda's new testimony against herself, summoning the three women in question. But their recollection of events differed from the defendant's. Aladaycis and her two friends, each of whom was examined individually, all initially denied that Auda had ever said she did not believe in God, maintaining this position even when "asked often, and still more often, and frequently . . . examined with care [*interrogata sepe et sepius et frequenter . . . cum diligentia inquisita*]."[168] In fact, these women seem to have been attempting to protect Auda. Certainly none of them had been inclined to come forward and accuse her, even in the oblique manner utilized by Ermengardis. But when Auda was produced from the ecclesiastical prison, she repeated her testimony and helped the women "bring to mind" (*reducte ad memoriam*) what had really occurred, and each eventually corroborated Auda's self-incriminating testimony.[169] Her efforts to correct her companions' recollection of events corresponds to her own obsessive concern for detail. But in the act of correction, Auda also fulfills the traditional role of informant that is not only expected but mandatory for converted heretics. (And, as Nicolas Eymeric acknowledges, there is no judicial difference between heresy and error; this is clear not only from the way that Auda is treated procedurally, but also from the corresponding expectation that she denounce all others somehow implicated in her error.)[170] As a result of Auda's testimony, all three of the women were charged with perjury.[171]

There were plenty of physiological symptoms that, from a medieval perspective, could be enlisted to explain Auda's spiritual disorder. She was delirious in the course of her illness. Afterward, she was given to violent outbursts of despair. Once when Auda began to cry out and tear at her clothes in the presence of Aladaycis and Guillelma, Auda's servant, the women assumed she was having a seizure, since she "was accustomed to suffer then from the falling illness of Saint Paul." Auda expostulated, " 'Oh, what should I do? for I have lost my mind and rave and cannot appeal to God or the Blessed Virgin Mary!' " and she begged them to go down on their knees and pray to Mary on her behalf, which they immediately did.[172] Medieval authorities would probably have assumed that Auda's epilepsy, in conjunction with her recent illness, produced an excess of black bile, which, in turn, gave rise to a melancholia that eroded her mental stability.

Whatever one might think about this diagnostic line of reasoning, one factor seems clear: Auda's restless spirituality bears the unmistakable stamp of the confessional. Her inner conflict was rooted in an unconfessed sin: the tension between the shame entailed in confessing and the compulsion to confess undermined her mental

health. Her crisis seems to peak, and then abate, in the course of her trial. Auda's case is not unique: the unconfessed sin occupies a sizable role in the personal histories of various famous penitents. Angela of Foligno's autobiographical account of her conversion begins with an unconfessed sin and a prayer that she would find a confessor whom she could trust. Both the book and the spiritual odyssey of Margery Kempe (d. after 1438) begin with the dilemma of a secret sin. When Margery attempted to unburden herself of this long concealed offense, the confessor reproved her before she had even really begun, and she fell silent, refusing to speak further. Dread of damnation then drove Margery into a bout of madness that lasted for over eight months. She was eventually cured by Christ and subsequently gripped by so pressing a need for frequent confession that she sometimes confessed two or three times a day.[173] There are also numerous instances in the exemplum tradition in which an unconfessed sin haunts various offenders, who are invariably depicted as female.[174] Confessors were aware of this problem. Gerson's objections to the growing number of reserved sins, those that can be absolved only by the bishop, are largely grounded in the assumption that female penitents particularly, whether from shyness or fear of the husband's detection, would be inclined not to confess such a sin.[175] In addition, Auda's continual, and successful, effort toward a more complete recollection of the circumstances surrounding her error coincides with the kind of cross-examination that a conscientious penitent is expected to practice on him-or herself in preparation for confession.[176] Her success in prompting the memories of the other witnesses by bringing to mind (*reducta ad memoriam*) past occurrences corresponds to what the confessor is supposed to do in the event that the penitent is incapable of remembering his or her sins. In fact, *reducta ad memoriam* is the precise phrase used in John of Freiburg's influential manual for confessors to describe this process.[177] And this task, of course, corresponds to the duties of the inquisitor.

Auda's behavior thus effaces the boundaries between scrupulous penitent, cooperative heretic under cross-examination, and reformed heretic turned informer. Bishop Fournier's role is simpler. Inquisitional manuals make it clear that the inquisitor's persecution of heretics was perceived not as conflicting with his pastoral role but rather as extending it. In the context of sacramental confession, Raymond of PeÑafort had described how "the twisted [*tortuosus*] serpent should be led forth by the obstetrical hand from the breast of the sinner." Gui effortlessly adopts and develops this unfortunate metaphor. The sinner gives way to the heretic, while the inquisitor is likened to

> a prudent physician of souls, [who] will proceed cautiously in regard to the

> persons whom he questions or concerning whom he makes inquiry. He will weigh their quality, condition, standing, health, and local circumstances, and will act with caution on the matters upon which there is to be inquiry and examination. . . .With the bridle of discretion, let him so harness the wiles of heretical persons that, with the help of God and the skill of the midwife, he may draw the writhing serpent from the sink and abyss of errors.[178]

In a similar vein, Ugolini, hoping to effect a conversion before sending a heretic to the stake, urges the inquisitor to try blandishments (*blanditijs*) and right counsel, again paralleling the gentle demeanor recommended for confessors.[179] In these ways at least, the inquisitor's self-understanding and the confessor's were identical.

There is every reason to believe that Auda herself collaborated with the inquisitor in sustaining his pastoral self-image. In addition to her striking complicity in plumbing the depths of her own conscience as well as those of her companions, she associates her release from the numbing experience of delusional error with her summons before the inquisition. Thus at the time of Auda's first testimony, "she was and remained continuously in that error, as she said, up until the present time when she was led . . . before the said lord bishop . . . in whose presence she said that the Blessed Virgin Mary sent it into her heart anew so that she believed that it was the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament."[180] The pivotal role of the inquisitor in Auda's conversion becomes even more apparent in her next appearance, when she emends her testimony as follows: "And then she persevered in the said error continuously until last Saturday. Now, however, as she said, she had put aside the said error and believed, as she said, firmly all the articles of the faith and sacraments of the church with them having been explained individually by the said bishop on that occasion." [181]

Auda was lucky in the end: her scrupulosity resulted only in very mild penalties. Her request for private penance was respected; thus she was spared the public infamy she so dreaded.[182] Nevertheless, her case suggests a failure to distinguish sufficiently between the two types of confessional tribunals, an understandable confusion considering the overlap of both personnel and method. The potential for slippage between the two fora was not only omnipresent; it would become particularly ominous should the interstitial figure of confessor-inquisitor choose to abuse his position. In fact, an inchoate awareness of the way in which a corrupt inquisitor might exploit a woman's scrupulosity is already inscripted in an episode that ostensibly occurred during the antiheretical purge of Dominican Robert le Bougre. The thirteenth-century chronicler Richer of Sens relates how Robert told a beautiful matron attending his preaching to wait for him after the sermon. When she unsuspiciously followed him to a private spot "where she expected to make her confession to him,"

he attempted to seduce her. She resisted and he countered by threatening to have her burned for heresy. On the very next day, moreover, he nearly made good his threat: placing his hand (which contained a concealed piece of parchment inscribed with certain magical words) on her forehead, Robert compelled the innocent woman to confess herself a heretic. She was saved by her son, who fortunately learned of Robert's ruse from someone familiar with his techniques. Appearing at the bishop's consistory where his mother was to be reexamined, he wrested the parchment from Robert's hand, breaking the spell and permitting the woman to protest her innocence. Robert was perpetually enclosed in a stone prison.[183]

The incident of Robert le Bougre and his nameless female victim can be read as a potential repository for social anxieties on the subject of confession, probing and possibly critiquing the dual aspect of the confessional relationship. The parchment operates much like the purloined letter in Poe's story: according to Lacan's analysis, we never learn what is written in the document, which is nevertheless possessed of the power to dictate a shifting array of subject positions formed in relation to it.[184]

Robert's parchment is equally inscrutable and transformative. It metamorphoses the matron, implicated by the female predisposition to confess, into a heretic, just as the confessor, implicated by the dual nature of confession, is transformed into an inquisitor—one whose methods anticipate the modern techniques responsible for the feared specter of the false confession.[185] The demarcation between the penitential forum and its heretical counterpart gives way, as do the ephemeral boundaries separating the heretic's stake from the martyr's pyre.

[1] E. Longpré, ed., "Fr. Rogeri Marston et anonymi doctoris OFM quaestiones ineditae de B. Francisci stigmatibus," *Antonianum* 7 (1932): 242; Angela of Foligno, *Il libro della Beata Angela da Foligno* 1.1, ed. Ludger Thier and Abele Calufetti (Grottaferrata, Rome: College of Saint Bonaventure, 1985), pp. 144–45; trans. Paul Lachance, in *Angela of Foligno: Complete Works* (New York: Paulist Press, 1993), pp. 128–29; Giacomo Scalza, *Leggenda latina della B. Giovanna detta Vanna d'Orvieto del Terz' Ordine di S. Domenico* c. 10, ed. and trans. V. Marreddu (Orvieto: Sperandeo Pompei, 1853), p. 36. (Vanna made this remark to her prioress following the revelation of her impending death.)

[2] Exceptions are made for exceptional individuals. Thus Francis of Assisi was said to have openly referred to Brother Rufino as a saint—albeit in the latter's absence. See Actus B. Francisci et sociorum eius c. 37, in *Fontes Franciscani*, ed. Enrico Menesto` and Stefano Brufani (Assisi: Edizioni Porziuncola, 1995), p. 2165; ed. and trans. in *St. Francis of Assisi: Writings and Early Biographies*, ed. Marion Habig (Chicago: Franciscan Herald, 1973), p. 1378.

[3] On living saints, see Aviad Kleinberg, *Prophets in Their Own Country: Living Saints and the Making of Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); AndréVauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*, trans. Jean Birrell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 433–43; and Gabrielle Zarri, *Le sante vive: cultura e religiosita` femminile nella prima*

et[agrave] moderna (Turin: Rosenberg and Sellier, 1990).

[4] John of Marienwerder, *Vita Dorotheae Montoviensis Magistri Johannis Marienwerder* 1.7, ed. Hans Westpfahl, Forschungen und Quellen zur Kirchen- und Kulturgeschichte Ostdeutsch-lands, vol. 1 (Cologne and Graz: Boïhlau, 1964), p. 50.

[5] R. C. Van Caenegem, "Methods of Proof in Western Medieval Law," *Mededelingen van Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen Letteren en Schone Kunsten van Belgieï, Academiae Analecta* 45, 3 (1983): 111–12. For example, it was largely adopted in Flanders over the course of the thirteenth century, but not in Germany until the fifteenth. Adhémar Esmein notes that the spread of inquisitional methods in secular society corresponds to the centralization of despotic power (*A History of Continental Criminal Procedure with Special Reference to France*, trans. John Simpson [Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1913], p. 10).

[6] For a more detailed discussion, see Dyan Elliott, "The Physiology of Rapture and Female Spirituality," in *Medieval Theology and the Natural Body*, ed. Peter Biller and Alastair Minnis (Woodbridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell and Brewer, 1997), pp. 141–73. Much of the following discussion is indebted to this article. Also see Richard Kieckhefer, *Unquiet Souls: Fourteenth-Century Saints and Their Religious Milieu* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), pp. 150–79.

[7] *VLA*, pp. 192–93; trans. King, p. 12.

[8] *De apibus* 2.33.4, pp. 371–72.

[9] See the original, longer vita (*vita prior*) of John Brugeman (d. 1473) in *AA SS*, April, 2:281. Brugeman's shorter life (*vita posterior*) is also printed in *AA SS*, April, 2:270–301; the longer life is on cols. 302–62.

[10] *VCM*, pp. 653, 656; trans. King, pp. 10, 21. See Walter Simons, "Reading a Saint's Body: Rapture and Bodily Movement in the *Vitae* of Thirteenth-Century Beguines," in *Framing Medieval Bodies*, ed. Sara Kay and Miri Rubin (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1994), pp. 10–23; cf. Jacques Le Goff, "Gestures in Purgatory," in *The Medieval Imagination*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), pp. 86–92.

[11] *De apibus* 2.41.3, p. 411. Though the woman is described as a nun, this probably refers to Mary of Oignies, who produced a sweet involuntary song just prior to her death (*VMO*, p. 562; trans. King, p. 95).

[12] Scalza, *Leggenda latina della B. Giovana detta Vanna* c. 5, pp. 13–18.

[13] Ibid. c. 6, pp. 22–23. Cf. *De apibus* 2.54.4, p. 519; Enrico Menesto`, ed., *Il processo di canonizzazione di Chiara da Montefalco* (Regione dell'Umbria: La Nuova Italia, 1984), Sr. Marina, witness 38, ad art. 42, pp. 117–18.

[14] *AA SS*, February, 3:320. The vita is by her confessor, Giunta Bevegnati.

[15] Ibid., p. 308.

[16] *AA SS*, June, 5:248. Christina's life was written by the theologian Peter of Dacia. For a discussion of the peculiarities of Peter's account and a detailed analysis of their relationship, see Kleinberg, *Prophets*, pp. 71–98.

[17] Kleinberg, *Prophets*, pp. 121–25; Daniel Bornstein, "Violenza al corpo di una santa: fra agiografia e pornografia. A proposito di Douceline di Digne," *Quaderni medievali* 39 (1995): 31–46.

[18] Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 245 ff. As Bynum herself points out, the eucharistic cult is also animated by a virulent antisemitism that gives rise to these tales of host desecration (pp. 63–64). An exaggerated instance of proving the host occurs in the antisemitic *Play of the Sacrament* (in Norman Davis, ed., *Non-Cycle Plays and*

Fragments, EETS, supp. text, no. 1 [London: Oxford University Press for EETS, 1970], pp. 58–89). On alleged historical instances, see Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).

19 See, for example, Placido Tommaso Lugnano, ed., *I processi inediti per Francesca Bussa dei Ponziani (Santa Francesca Romana, 1440–1453*) (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1945), process of 1440, pp. 27, 31, 65. For the elaborate explanation of how she could speak in this condition, see *AA SS*, March, 2:147. Cf. Dyan Elliott, "*Dominae* or *Dominatae*? Female Mystics and the Trauma of Textuality," in *Women, Marriage, and Family in Medieval Christendom: Essays in Memory of Michael M. Sheehan, C.S.B.*, ed. Constance Rousseau and Joel Rosenthal (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, 1998), pp. 68–76. John Mattiotti was not particularly learned, as his vernacular life suggests. Some of his proofs reflect this lack of sophistication.

20 Lugnano, *I processi*, process of 1440, p. 149.

21 Ibid., pp. 29, 61–62.

22 Ibid., p. 64.

23 *AA SS*, March, 2:147.

24 Ibid. The confessor's efforts to collect proof could backfire. Lydwine of Schiedam asked to be left alone because an ecstasy was coming on. But when the confessor furtively reentered the room to observe, the rapturing angel would come no nearer (John Brugeman, *vita prior*, *AA SS*, April, 4:284). For the role of angels in rapture, see Elliott, "Physiology of Rapture," pp. 149–51.

25 "Vita Elizabeth sanctimonialis in Erkenrode, Ordinis Cisterciensis" c. 2, in the Bollandists' *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum bibliothecae regiae bruxellensis* (Brussels: Polleunis, Ceuterick et Lefebure, 1886), 1,1:363. A Middle English translation of Elisabeth's life has also been edited by C. Hortman, in "Proslegenden: Die Legenden des MS. Douce 114," *Anglia* 8 (1885): 107–18. On Elisabeth's cult, see Walter Simons and J. E. Ziegler, "Phenomenal Religion in the Thirteenth Century and Its Image: Elisabeth of Spalbeek and the Passion Cult," in *Women in the Church*, ed. W. J. Sheils and Diana Wood, Studies in Church History, vol. 27 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), pp. 117–26; Godefrido Geenen, *BS*, cols. 1100–1109. Despite later claims, Elisabeth was not affiliated with any order.

26 Philip of Clairvaux, "Vita Elizabeth" c. 13, p. 371.

27 Ibid. c. 18, p. 373.

28 Ibid. c. 21, p. 375.

29 Ibid. c. 23, p. 376. William, not present for the event, was relying on the testimony of Elisabeth's mother and sisters, with whom she lived.

30 Ibid. c. 29, p. 378.

31 Ibid. c. 30, p. 378.

32 Gilbert of Tournai, *Collectio de scandalis ecclesiae* c. 25, ed. Autbertus Stroick, *AFH* 24 (1931): 62. On Franciscan territorialism concerning the stigmata, see AndréVauchez, "Les stigmates de Saint Fran ç ois et leurs detracteurs," *MEFRM* 80 (1968): 608–12. When defending Francis's stigmata, Peter Thomas denies that Paul's remarks about bearing the stigmata on his body should be taken literally (Gal. 6.17), insisting on Francis's singularity (Gaudens Mohan, ed., "Petrus Thomae on the Stigmata of St. Francis," *Franciscan Studies* 8 [1948]: 286, 294).

33 Vauchez, "Les stigmates," p. 609.

34 Guillaume de Nangis, *Gesta Philippi tertii Francorum regis* ann. 1276, in *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed. Danou et Naudet (Paris: Imprimerie Royal, 1840), 20:502; see A. Mens, "L'Ombrie italienne et l'Ombrie

braban ç onne: Deux courants religieux paralle`les d'inspiration commune," *Etudes Franciscaines*, annual supplement, 17 (1967): 27 n. 51. On this episode, see Dyan Elliott, "Women and Confession: From Empowerment to Pathology," in *Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages*, ed. Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2003), pp. 37–38.

[35] *AA SS*, April, 2:304–5. A translation of this letter is found in Thomas a` Kempis, *Lydwine of Schiedam, Virgin*, ed. and trans. Vincent Scully (London: Burns and Oates, 1912), pp. 16–22.

[36] *AA SS*, April, 2:305.

[37] Lydwine exemplifies Bynum's contention regarding illness as something to be endured, not cured ("The Female Body and Religious Practice in the Later Middle Ages," in *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* [New York: Zone Books, 1991], p. 189). This pattern was increasingly articulated over time. For instance, Stephen of Bourbon describes how a holy woman, known from other sources to be the French Alpaiïs of Sens (d. 1211), was so horribly afflicted by ulcers that her innards appeared outside, paralleling Lydwine's later condition. Alpaiïs was healed by the Virgin Mary, while Lydwine's sanctity was manifested by her not being healed. See Stephen of Bourbon, *Anecdotes historiques, l è gendes et apologues tir è s du recueil in è dit d'Etienne de Bourbon* no. 19, ed. A. Lecoy de la Marche (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1877), pp. 26–28; also see James of Vitry, *Historia occidentalis of Jacques de Vitry*, ed. John Frederick Hinnebusch (Fribourg: University Press of Fribourg, 1972), pp. 87–88; Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale* 29.23, in *Speculum quadruplex; sive Speculum maius* (Douai: B. Belleri, 1624), 4:1193, and Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum* 7.20, ed. Joseph Strange (Cologne, Bonn, Brussels: J. M. Heberle, 1851), 2:25; trans. H. Von E. Scott and C. C. Swinton Bland, *The Dialogue on Miracles* (London: Routledge, 1929), 2:150–51. Caesarius does not mention her cure. Cf. Stephen of Bourbon's account of a nun at Puy suffering a similar condition and likewise healed by Mary (*Anecdotes* no. 320, p. 270).

[38] Amy Hollywood, for example, shows the ways in which the account that Beatrice of Nazareth (d. 1268) gives of her spirituality is rendered in much more physical terms by her hagiographer. See "Inside Out: Beatrice of Nazareth and Her Hagiographer," in *Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and Their Interpreters*, ed. Catherine Mooney (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), pp. 78–98.

[39] On Lucia's sojourn in Ferrara, see G. Marcianese, *Narratione della nascita, vita, e morte della B. Lucia da Narni* c. 32 (Ferrara: V. Buldini, 1616), pp. 144 ff. On Ercole's political deployment of Lucia, see Zarri, *Le sante vive*, pp. 51–62. For Lucia's correspondence with the duke concerning her relocation to Ferrara, see Luigi Gandini, ed., *Sulla venuta in Ferrara della beata suor Lucia da Narni* (Modena: Societa` tipografica, 1901). On Lucia's unconsummated marriage, see Dyan Elliott, *Spiritual Marriage: Sexual Abstinence in Medieval Wedlock* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993), pp. 218, 220–22.

[40] Ercole d'Este, *Spiritualium personarum feminei sexus facta admiratione digna. Transumpta quedam ex parte Sororis Lucie quarundamque aliarum Sororum nuncupate de tercia Regula diui patris Dominici ordinis predicatorum primi fundatoris: quorum originalia cum quibusdam notabilibus testimoniis habentur in Conuentu Nurmburgensi eiusdem ordinis* (Nuremberg, 1501?), fol. 2r; these proofs also appear in Marcianese, *Narratione . . . della B. Lucia da Narni* c. 37, pp. 169–81. Ercole's defense extends to other holy women of the region, for instance the raptures and enactment of the passion of a certain Steffana of Quinzano (fol.

3r). He also affirms the contemporary cults of Sister Columba of Perusia and Susana of Mantua (fols. 2v–3v) His own seal is affixed to the end of the entire statement (fol. 3v).

41 These include Theobald of Nuremburg (Este, *Spiritualium personarum*, fol. 3v); Nicolaus Maria Estensis, bishop Adriensis (fols. 4v–5r); Peter Tranensis, bishop of Ferrara and doctor of theology and arts (fols. 5r–6r); and some canon lawyers from Ferrara (fols. 6r–v).

42 Albert Huyskens, ed., *Quellenstudien zur Geschichte der hl. Elisabeth Landgraïfin von Thuïringen* (Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche, 1908), testimony of four handmaids, p. 138. Cf. Gregory IX's parallel allusion ("Die heilige Elisabeth und Papst Gregor IX," ed. Karl Wenck, *Hochland* 2 [1907]: 145). Hippolyte Delehaye uses the famous example of Elisabeth hiding, in her bed, a leper who is then transformed into Christ to demonstrate this constant devolution from the abstract to the concrete. Originally when Ludwig saw the leper, the eyes of his soul were opened and he saw Christ. But later accounts will insist on the physical reality of the leper (*Legends of the Saints*, trans. Donald Attwater [New York: Fordham University Press, 1962], p. 68). Since Paul was arguing against circumcision, a literal interpretation was probably the furthest thing from his mind. For bibical passages that similarly refer to the law (etc.) being written in hearts, see, for example, Prov. 3.3, Jer. 31.33, 2 Cor. 3.2.

43 Michel de Certeau, *The Mystic Fable*, vol. 1, *The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, trans. Michael Smith (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), p. 26; on the relationship between a female mystic's illness and the production of mystical texts, see ibid., p. 191; Elliott, "*Dominae* or *Dominatae*?" p. 64.

44 Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum* 5.22, 1:306; trans. Scott and Bland, 1:350.

45 Giovanni Boccaccio, *The Decameron* 4th day, 2d story, trans. G. H. McWilliam (Harmonds-worth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1981), p. 348.

46 There has been some work on fraudulent sanctity for the early modern period. See Gabrielle Zarri, ed., *Finzione e santita` tra medioevo ed eta` moderna* (Turin: Rosenberg and Sellier, 1991); Anne Schutte, *Aspiring Saints: Pretense of Holiness, Inquisition, and Gender in the Republic of Venice, 1618–1750* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001); Judith Brown, *Immodest Acts: The Life of a Lesbian Nun in Renaissance Italy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

47 See Luigi Jacobilli, *Vite de' santi e beati dell'Vmbria* (Foligno: Appresso Agostino Alterij, 1661), 3:46; Marcianese, *Narratione . . . della B. Lucia da Narni* c. 42, p. 217. Lucia was demoted as prioress and kept in quasi-imprisonment until her death in 1544. Her degradation occurred soon after the death of Ercole in 1505. For growing ambivalence toward mystical phenomena, see Alison Weber, "Between Ecstasy and Exorcism: Religious Negotiation in Sixteenth-Century Spain," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 23 (1993): 221–34.

48 Richer of Sens, *Richeri Gesta Senoniensis ecclesiae* 4.9, ed. G. Waitz. *MGH SS*, 25:309–10.

See Peter Dinzelbacher, *Heilige oder Hexen? Schicksale auffaïlliger Frauen in Mittelalter und Fruïhneuzeit* (Munich: Artemis and Winkler, 1995), pp. 77–78. Cf. Elliott, "Women and Confession," pp. 38–40.

49 Fraudulent raptures can also be deployed by orthodoxy, as in Caesarius of Heisterbach's account of a certain cleric feigning rapture to infiltrate a heretical ring cited in the above epigraph. But generally such pretense is associated with false prophets—especially those anticipated in the period of the Antichrist. See Peter d'Ailly's *De falsis prophetis*, in L. Ellies du Pin's edition of Gerson's works, *Joannis Gersonii opera omnia* (Antwerp: Sumptibus societatis, 1706), vol. 1, col.

521.

[50] See William of Auvergne's *De universo* pt. 2, 2, c. 152, in *Opera omnia* (Paris: A. Pralard, 1674; reprint, Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1963), 1:1002.

[51] Richer, *Gesta* 4.19, p. 309. Cf. an incident in Sulpicius Severus's life of Saint Martin in which an individual who claims communication with angels promises to appear in an angelic robe, thereby proving "the power of God" (*Vie de Saint Martin* c. 23, ed. Jacques Fontaine, *SC*, no. 133 [Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1967], 1:304–7; trans. Alexander Roberts, *The Life of Saint Martin*, *LNPNF*, vol. 11 [Ann Arbor, Mich.: Eerdman's, 1964], p. 15).

[52] Richer, by his own admission striving for gender balance in perfidious potential, introduces his account of Sybil immediately following the relation of Robert's very different fraudulent practices (see p. 229, below).

[53] Richer, *Gesta* 4.19, p. 309.

[54] On Magdalena's life, see Karen Greenspan's introduction to her edition of Magdalena's mystical work "*Erklaerung des Vaterunsers*: A Critical Edition of a Fifteenth-Century Mystical Treatise by Magdalena Beutler of Freiburg" (Ph.D. diss. University of Massachusetts, 1984), pp. 12–32; also see Dinzelbacher, *Heilige oder Hexen?*, pp. 91–94.

[55] These include a nun who confessed she had been feigning revelations for attention and a woman who organized an event at which she was supposed to receive the stigmata (*Formicarium* 3.1 [Douai: B. Belleri, 1602], pp. 185–86). For his account of Joan of Arc and her impersonator, see chap. 7, pp. 294–95, below.

[56] Ibid. 3.8, p. 230; see Greenspan, "*Erklaerung*," introd., pp. 30, 43–49, 52. Magdalena attempted to seize control of the mechanisms of proof, asking to see her confessor "and other learned men" in order to explain her absences. According to her vita, they were satisfied with these explanations (ibid., pp. 49–51).

[57] Nider, *Formicarium* 3.8, pp. 230–31.

[58] Greenspan cites the evidence of Magdalena's vita ("*Erklaerung*," p. 73 n. 30).

[59] Nider, *Formicarium* 3.8, p. 231.

[60] William of Auvergne, *De universo* pt. 2, 2, c. 36, in *Opera*, 1:881.

[61] *Formicarium* 3.1, pp. 181, 184. On her mystical death, see Greenspan, "*Erklaerung*," introd.,pp. 69–82. Greenspan notes that nineteenth-century scholarship dismissed Magdalena as a hysteric (pp. 5–6). For the association of mysticism, hysteria, and degenerative eroticism at the fin de sie`cle, see Cristina Mazzoni, *Saint Hysteria: Neurosis, Mysticism, and Gender in European Culture* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996), pp. 17–44, 54–89.

[62] *Formicarium* 3.8, p. 234.

[63] Ibid. 3.8, p. 235. Some revelations of one's own demise are legitimate, as in the case of Vanna of Orvieto (see the third epigraph at the start of this chapter).

[64] Karen Scott, "Mystical Death, Bodily Death: Catherine of Siena and Raymond of Capua on the Mystic's Encounter with God," in *Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and Their Interpreters*, ed. Catherine Mooney (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), pp. 140, 152–53, 159–60, 165; Barbara Newman, *From Virile Woman to WomanChrist: Studies in Medieval Religion and Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995), pp. 173–74; Robert Lerner, *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972), p. 218.

[65] On her ill-health and its relation to her punishing fasts, see Greenspan, "*Erklaerung*," introd.,pp. 22, 26; cf. 28. Nider thinks that Magdalena inherited

from her mother the ability of abstracting herself from her body (Nider, *Formicarium* 3.8, p. 232). According to Magdalena's vita, her father was also subject to trances (Greenspan, "*Erklaerung*," introd., p. 21).

66 Greenspan, "*Erklaerung*," introd., pp. 15–16. Greenspan posits that the vita may have been intended to allay fears of heterodoxy in the wake of her mystical death, possibly in preparation for a canonization. Cf. Marcianese's defensiveness with regard to Lucia of Narni's self-authored life (*Narratione della . . . B. Lucia da Narni* c. 23, p. 102).

67 The visit to her house is rather elliptical, and the text is damaged. It seems that her parents were admitted to heaven "after they came to the incontinent one [*incontinenti*] at her house for a little while" (Ignatius von Doïllinger, ed., *Beitraïge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters* [Munich: C. H. Beck'sche, 1890], no. 72, 2:707). I can only imagine that *incontinenti* is intended by Rixendis as a self-deprecatory characterization. Nevertheless, a similar phrase is repeated again on the next day, again with respect to certain souls' transit from purgatory to heaven (2:708).

68 ". . . in praesentia dictorum dominorum fingebat, se raptam et non loquebatur," ibid., p. 707.

69 Ibid., pp. 707–8.

70 Ibid., p. 709.

71 Ibid., p. 710.

72 Cf. Frances of Rome's experience (Elliott, "*Dominae* or *Dominatae*?" pp. 75–76).

73 Philip of Clairvaux, "Vita Elizabeth" c. 7, p. 367; cf. the testimony of the seventh anonymous witness, in Doïllinger, *Beitraïge*, no. 72, 2:711.

74 Doïllinger, *Beitraïge*, seventh witness, no. 72, 2:709.

75 See chap. 2, p. 68; chap. 4, p. 178, above.

76 *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, ed. and trans. James Strachey et al. (London: Hogarth Press, 1958), 12:13–14.

77 E. Longpré, ed., "Fr. Rogeri Marston," p. 241.

78 See Danielle Jacquart, in *Le Milieu m è dical en France du XIIe au XVe sie`cle: en annexe 2e suppl è ment au "Dictionnaire" d'ErnestWickersheimer* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1981), tables 31–34, p. 393; cf.William Courtenay, "Curers of Body and Soul: Medical Doctors as Theologians," in *Religion and Medicine in the Middle Ages*, ed. Peter Biller and Joseph Ziegler (Woodbridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press in conjunction with Boydell and Brewer, 2001), pp. 69, 72. The quintessential doctor-theologian is Arnau of Vilanova. See Joseph Ziegler, *Medicine and Religion, c. 1300: The Case of Arnau of Vilanova* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), esp. pp. 47 ff. for a detailed examination of the compatibility of religious and medical language; and Michael McVaugh, "Moments of Inflection: The Careers of Arnau of Vilanova," in Biller and Ziegler, *Religion and Medicine*, pp. 47–68.

79 Much of the following section is derived from Elliott, "Physiology of Rapture," pp. 141–73, esp. 157–61; also see eadem, *Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), pp. 40–45.

80 *An Alphabet of Tales: An English Fifteenth Century Translation of the Alphabetum narrationum of Etienne de Besanc ç on*, ed. M. M. Banks, *EETS*, o.s., no. 127, pt. 2 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1905), no. 741, pp. 494–95.

81 Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum naturale* 2.36, in *Speculum quadruplex*, vol. 1, col. 1629; also cf. 2.43, col. 1634. See Augustine, *On the Trinity* 11.2, trans. A. W. Haddan, in *St. Augustin: On the Holy Trinity, Doctrinal Treatises, Moral*

Treatises, *LNPNFC*, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmann's, 1887), p. 147.

[82] Pietro Pompanazzi, *De naturalium effectuum admirandorum causis, seu De incantationibus liber* c. 5, in *Opera* (Basel: Ex officina Henricpetrina, 1567), pp. 67–68 and 81–84; cf. c. 3, p. 32; see Zarri, *Le sante vive*, p. 59.

[83] For William's balancing of science and theology, see Noeïl Valois, *Guillaume d'Auvergne, eve ê que de Paris (1228–1249): sa vie et ses ouvrages* (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1880), pp. 265–310.

[84] William of Auvergne, *De universo* pt. 2, 3, c. 20, in *Opera*, 1:1054. See Juliana Schiesari, *The Gendering of Melancholia: Feminism, Psychoanalysis, and the Symbolics of Loss in Renaissance Literature* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992), pp. 96–112.

[85] There were exceptions: Hildegard of Bingen implies she was possessed of a melancholic complexion, which would help to explain her receptivity to visions. See Peter Dronke, *Women Writers of the Middle Ages: A Critical Study of Texts from Perpetua (*] *203) to Marguerite Porete (*] *1310)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 182–83; Barbara Newman, *Sister of Wisdom: St. Hildegard's Theology of the Feminine* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 132–33. But unlike the traditional idealization of melancholy, Hildegard's reading was extremely negative (Schiesari, *The Gendering of Melancholia*, pp. 141–59).

[86] William of Auvergne, *De universo* pt. 2, 3, c. 20, in *Opera*, 1:1054.

[87] Ibid. pt. 2, 3, c. 24, 1:1066. Valois sees William's work as a repository for thirteenth-century superstition, even when denouncing it (*Guillaume d'Auvergne*, pp. 311–32).

[88] William of Auvergne, *De anima* pt. 33, in *Opera*, 2:193; *De universo* pt. 2, 3, c. 13 and c. 21, in *Opera*, 1:1041 and 1058; cf. Denis the Carthusian (d. 1471), *De contemplatione libri tres* 3.18, in *D. Dionysi Cartusiani opera omnia in unum corpus digesta*, vol. 41, *Opera minora* (Tournai: Typis Carthusiae S. M. de Pratis, 1911), 9:279. Also see Galen, *On the Affected Parts* 3.9 –10, trans. R. E. Siegel (Basel: S. Karger, 1968), pp. 88–94.

[89] William of Auvergne, *De universo* pt. 2, 3, c. 20, 21, in *Opera*, 1:1054, 1058 (note that chaps. 20 and 21 both appear as c. 20 in this edition).

[90] Albertus Magnus, *Quaestiones de animalibus* bk. 15 q. 11, as cited in Helen Rodnite Lemay, trans., *Women's Secrets: A Translation of Pseudo-Albertus Magnus's "De Secretis Mulierum" with Commentaries* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), introd., p. 48. Also see Alcuin Blamires, *The Case for Women in Medieval Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), p. 127. For the pejorative connotation of the term "mobility," see John Cassian's "De animae mobilitate et spiritualibus nequitiis," in *Confer è nces*, ed. and trans. E. Pichery, *SC*, 42 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1955), 1:242–77.

[91] Such pathologization is an ongoing trend. See Mazzoni's *Saint Hysteria*, esp. introd., pp. 1–16. On the mystics' exploitation of hysteria to undermine the mind-body split, see pp. 156–96, esp. 177–90 for Angela of Foligno.

[92] Lemay, *Women's Secrets* c. 11, p. 132.

[93] Ibid., Commentator B, p. 134.

[94] Thomas of Cantimpré, *Liber de natura rerum* 1.60, ed. H. Boese (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1973), 1:66.

[95] See Jeffrey Hamburger's delineation of the interaction between vision and devotion in a late medieval female religious community, *Nuns as Artists: The Visual Culture of a Medieval Convent* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997), esp. pp. 128 ff.; and Chiara Frugoni, "Female Mystics, Visions, and Iconography," in *Women and Religion in Medieval and Renaissance Italy*, ed. Daniel Bornstein and Roberto Rusconi, trans. Margery Schneider

(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), pp. 130–64.

[96] See Elliott, *Fallen Bodies*, pp. 40–41.

[97] Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum naturale* 25.84, in *Speculum quadruplex*, vol. 1, col. 1828. Cf. Thomas of Cantimpré, *Liber de natura rerum* 2.15, 1:95.

[98] Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum naturale* 26.66, in *Speculum quadruplex*, vol. 1, col. 1879; cf. 2.119, col. 153; see Elliott, "Physiology of Rapture," p. 146.

[99] Danielle Jacquart and Claude Thomasset, *Sexuality and Medicine in the Middle Ages*, trans. M. Adamson (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988), pp. 83–84. See Galen's definition *On the Passions and Errors of the Soul*, trans. P. W. Harkins (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1963), p. 32, and Augustine's discussion in *De civitate dei* 19.4–6, ed. Bernardus Dombart and Alphonsus Kalb, *CCSL*, 48 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955), 2:664–71; trans. H. Bettenson, *City of God* 19.4–6 (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1972), pp. 345–51.

[100] William of Auvergne, *De universo* pt. 2, 3, c. 13, in *Opera*, 1:1041, 1043. He further seeks to substantiate his contention regarding demonic influence by noting that prayers of holy people prove effective where doctors have failed (1:1042). In Galenic tradition, melancholics can develop a lupine or canine disease (*morbus lupinus sive caninus*) whereby the sufferers are compelled to roam in a wolfish manner on February evenings (*De melancholia* c. 3, in *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, ed. C. G. Kühn [Leipzig, 1830; reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1965], 19:719). For the rising interest in werewolves in this period, see Caroline Walker Bynum's *Metamorphosis and Identity* (New York: Zone Books, 2001), pp. 92–98, 105–9. Cf. Avicenna's similar list of the delusions that the melancholic experiences, in *Liber canonis* bk. 3, fen. 1, tract. 4 (Venice, 1507; reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964), fols. 188v–89r; cf. Galen, *De melancholia* c. 1, in *Opera*, 19:702.

[101] Alexander of Hales (d. 1245), *Quaestiones disputatae "Antequam esset fratrem"* q. 68, membrum 7, c. 36–37, ed. Fathers of the College of Saint Bonaventure (Florence: College of Saint Bonaventure, 1960), 3:1358–59; cf. Aquinas on prophecy, *ST* 2a 2ae, q. 172, art. 2, resp. ad 3, 40:38–39.

[102] See, however,the bewilderment of Peter of Spain (d. 1277) over the fact that young people are more prone to lovesickness though less prone to melancholia than are the old, in his commentary on *Viaticum*, in Mary Wack, ed., *Lovesickness in the Middle Ages: The "Viaticum" and Its Commentaries* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990), pp. 242–43.

[103] Aquinas, *Expositio super Dionysium de divinis nominibus* lect. 10, in *Opuscula omnia*, ed. P. Mandonnet (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1927), 2:396; Gerson, *De theologia mystica* c. 39, in *Oeuvres*, 3:284; Denis the Carthusian, *De contemplatione libri tres* 3.18, in *Opera*, vol. 41, *Opera minora* 8:279. For human love as a mirror of divine love, see especially Richard of Saint Victor, *De quatuor gradibus violentiae caritatis*, *PL* 196, cols. 1207–24.

[104] William of Auvergne, *De anima* pt. 33, in *Opera*, 2:192.

[105] Aquinas, *ST* 2a 2ae, q. 175, art. 1, resp., 45:95–97; William of Auvergne, *De universo* pt. 2, 3, c. 13, in *Opera*, 1:1040; Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum naturale* 26.2, in *Speculum quadruplex*, vol. 1, cols. 1842–43; Denis the Carthusian, *De contemplatione libri tres* 3.18, in *Opera*, vol. 41, *Opera minora*, 8:278; Nider, *Formicarium* 5.1, p. 332. Other factors are likewise responsible for rapture, such as music, drugs, or fear (William of Auvergne, *De universo* pt. 2, 3, c. 13, c. 20, in *Opera*, 1:1040; 1056, 1057; idem, *De anima* pt. 33, in *Opera*, 2:192.

[106] See William of Auvergne, *De universo* pt. 2, 2, c. 35, in *Opera*, 1:879; cf. ibid., pt. 2, 3, c. 20, 1:1053. William gives the same list of delusions as

described above.

[107] William of Auvergne, *De anima* pt. 33, in *Opera*, 2:193; Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum naturale* 26.96–97, in *Speculum quadruplex*, vol. 1, cols. 1903–4. Vincent's discussion consists mainly of citations from Augustine's *The Literal Meaning of Genesis* bk. 12. Cf. Thomas of Cantimpré, *Liber de natura rerum* 2.13, 1:93–94.

[108] James of Vitry, *VMO*, p. 551; trans. King, p. 18. Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Die Wunder-geschichten des Caesarius von Heisterbach*, ed. Alfons Hilka (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1933), no. 62, 1:89; also see no. 290, 1:180. Elisabeth herself mentions them in F.W.E. Roth, ed., *Visionen* bk. 1 and *Liber revelationum* c. 5, in *Visionen der hl. Elisabeth* (Brünn: Raigerner Benedictiner Buchruckerei, 1884), pp. 1, 125; trans. Anne Clark, *Elisabeth of Schoïnau: The Complete Works* (New York: Paulist Press, 2000), pp. 41, 215.

[109] Menesto`, *Il processo*, Sr. Marina, witness 38, ad art. 42, pp. 117–18; Sr. Thomassa, witness 39, ad art. 42, p. 191; cf. Sr. Johanna, witness 1, ad art. 138, pp. 78–79.

[110] See Nider, *Formicarium* 2.1, 5.10, pp. 47, 406; Bernard Basin, *De artibus magicis ac magorum malificiis opus praeclarissimum sacrelegis disquisitoris magistri bernardi basin cesara-gustanensis ecclesie canonicum nuper amendis quam plurimis emendatum* (Paris: Denis Roce, 1506), see propositio 8 on demonic deception (unpaginated). Both these writers are indebted to William of Auvergne.

[111] Bede, *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* 1.27, ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), pp. 92–93; Raymond of Peñafort, *Summa de poenitentia et matrimonio* 1.5.10 (Rome: Joannes Tallini, 1603), p. 44; cf. x.5.7.1. The following section parallels Elliott, "Women and Confession," pp. 44–48.

[112] See chap. 4, n. 208, above. Though degraded as a cleric, Guiard was not necessarily a priest.

[113] Aquinas, *Scriptum super libros sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi* bk. 4, dist. 21, q. 2, art. 3, resp. and resp. ad 4, ed. Maria Fabianus Moos (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1947), 4:1066, 1067. For Angelo Carletti, such a lie was a mortal sin (*Summa angelica de casibus conscientialibus* (Venice: Iac. Sanouinum, 1569), ad *confessio sacramentalis*, no. 6, fol. 99r.

[114] See Thomas Tentler, *Sin and Confession on the Eve of the Reformation* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1977), pp. 75–78, 156–62; D. Catherine Brown, *Pastor and Laity in the Theology of Jean Gerson* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 68–72.

[115] Gerson, *De passionibus animae* c. 18, 21, in *Oeuvres*, 9:15, 17.

[116] Gerson, *De remediis contra pusillanimitatem*, in *Oeuvres*, 10:381. An alternative title to this work is *De scrupulis conscientiae*. Also see the French translation in *Oeuvres*, 8:386–98. Glorieux is unclear as to which version came first, but believes that the Latin was written before 30 July 1405 (introd., 8:386).

[117] Gerson, *De passionibus animae* c. 18, c. 20, in *Oeuvres*, 9:17, 20.

[118] Gerson, *De remediis*, in *Oeuvres*, 10:377. Gerson goes on to say that angels, good or bad, cannot enter the higher part of the soul. Cf. *De passionibus animae* c. 15, 9:13–14; c. 17, 9:15. See Elliott, *Fallen Bodies*, pp. 19, 44.

[119] Gerson, *De remediis*, in *Oeuvres*, 10:379; also see *De passionibus animae* c. 20, 9:19–20.

[120] Gerson, *De remediis*, in *Oeuvres*, 10:379; cf. 10:383. He also attempts to sensitize the priest to this problem. See his discussion of permissible formulas of absolution for the last rites to avoid driving the dying penitent to despair (*De forma absolvendi a peccatis*, 9:174).

[121] Gerson, *De remediis*, in *Oeuvres*, 10:381. This exculpation does not apply to the carnally minded and slothful (10:381–82). Also see *De directione cordis* c. 20–21, 8:102–3; *Traite é des diverses tentations de l'ennemi*, 7,2:353. Cf. Gerson's parallel evocation of the recitation of the hours and scupulosity (*De praeparatione ad missam*, in *Oeuvres*, 6th consideration, 9:43). See Elliott, *Fallen Bodies*, pp. 27–29.

[122] Gerson, *De remediis*, in *Oeuvres*, 10:381. His short treatise *Contre conscience trop scrupuleuse* discusses the fear of an insufficient confession (7,2:140–41).

[123] Gerson, *De remediis*, in *Oeuvres*, 10:381; cf. *Traite é des diverses tentations de l'ennemi*, 7,2:358. See Tentler, *Sin and Confession*, p. 158.

[124] Gerson, *De remediis*, in *Oeuvres*, 10:382, 385; *De meditatione cordis* c. 17, 8:82.

[125] Gerson, *De remediis*, in *Oeuvres*, 10:385; cf. *De cognitione castitatis*, 9:62. In this latter instance, he is addressing excessive scrupulosity over any kind of seminal emission. See Elliott, *Fallen Bodies*, p. 23. The Latin version of *De remediis* proposes that for a person who has not committed a mortal sin, if confession is more agitating than calming, then frequent confession should cease. Gerson adds that the person in question should still feel entitled to celebrate the eucharist—presupposing a clerical audience (10:384). The vernacular, however, permits the person to celebrate or communicate, thus accommodating a lay audience (10:387). Also see *Traite é des diverses tentations de l'ennemi*, in which excessive scrupulosity with regard to receiving communion is regarded as diabolical temptation (7,2:357).

[126] Gerson, *Regulae mandatorum* no. 7, in *Oeuvres*, 9:96; cf. C. 28 q. 1 dpc 14. Both Aquinas and Godefroid of Fontaines in their quodlibets on the subject of erroneous conscience likewise evoke this quotation (Aquinas, quodlib. 3, q. 12, art. 2 [27], *sed contra*, in *Opera omnia: Quaestiones de quolibet*, ed. Ordo Fratrum Praedicatorum [Rome: Commissio Leonina, 1996], 25,2:285), and Godefroid of Fontaines, *Les Quodlibets onze–quatorze de Godefroid de Fontaines*, ed. J. Hoffmans (Louvain: Editions de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, 1932), quodlib. 12, q. 2, vol. 5, fasc. 1–2, p. 85. See Odon Lottin, *Psychologie et morale aux XIIe et XIIIe sie`cles* (Louvain: Abbaye du Mont César, 1948), 2,1:394–98, 400–406; Xavier Colavechio, *Erroneous Conscience and Obligations: A Study of the Teaching from the Summa Halesiana, Saint Bonaventure, Saint Albert the Great, and Thomas Aquinas* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1961), pp. 67–103. Also see the discussion of erroneous conscience in chap. 6, pp. 241–44, below.

[127] Gerson, *De remediis*, in *Oeuvres*, 10:381; cf. *Regulae mandatorum* no. 7, 9:96; no. 8, 9:97; *Traite é des diverses tentations de l'ennemi*, 7:346 ff.; *De signis bonis et malis*, 9:163; *De praeparatione ad missam* 3d consideration, 9:37–39; *De meditatione cordis* c. 17, 8:82, 83; *Le profit de savoir quel est peche mortel et veniel*, 7,2:382.

[128] Gerson, *Regulae mandatorum* no. 23, in *Oeuvres*, 9:100; nos. 8–9, 9:97; no. 1, 9:95; Gerson, *Le profit de savoir*, 7,2:382.

[129] Gerson, *Le profit de savoir*, in *Oeuvres*, 7:370–89; also see *Examen de conscience selon les pe ê ches capitaux*, 7,2:393–400; *Regulae mandatorum*, 9:94–132.

[130] Gerson, *De meditatione cordis*, in *Oeuvres*, 8:82; *Regulae mandatorum* no. 7, 9:96.

[131] Pierre Michaud-Quantin, "La conscience individuelle et ses droits chez les moralistes de la fin du Moyen-Age," in *Universalismus und Partikularismus im Mittelalter*, ed. Paul Wilpert, Miscellanea mediaevalis, 5 (Berlin: Walter de

Gruyter, 1968), p. 50.

[132] Gerson, *De praeparatione ad missam*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:43. In Greek mythology, Scylla and Charybdis are female monsters, the former personifying a dangerous rock located between Italy and Sicily, the latter a whirlpool in the same area. Elsewhere, Gerson again cites Gregory's "habit of good minds" regarding the problem of erroneous conscience (Gerson, *De regulae mandatorum* no. 4, 9:96).

[133] *VLA*, p. 199, trans. King, pp. 45–46; p. 207, trans. King, p. 90; p. 209, trans. King, pp. 101–2; cf. the way Margaret of Ypres was likewise obsessed with the recital of her hours (*VMY*, pp. 116–17; trans. King, pp. 35–36).

[134] *VLA*, p. 199, trans. King, p. 45; cf. *De apibus* 2.52.4, pp. 482–83.

[135] Gerson, *De meditatione cordis*, in *Oeuvres*, 8:83–84. This passage appears only in selected manuscripts. Cf. John of Marienwerder's similar description of Dorothea and himself being "glued" together in *amicitia* on their first meeting, prefiguring a relationship that the visionary Lord equates with marriage (*Vita Dorotheae* 3.27.2, p. 149). Also see Gerson's account of the risks incurred through a converted matron's fervor (*De simplificatione cordis*, 8:95. Cf. *Traite é des diverses tentations de l'ennemi*, 7,2:348). Brian McGuire argues that Gerson's anxiety over same-sex friendship is rooted in his own experience, in "Jean Gerson and the End of Spiritual Friendship: Dilemmas of Conscience," in *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Julian Halsedine (Thrupp, UK: Sutton, 1999), pp. 236–38. Also see chap. 7, p. 268, below. Confessors' manuals were replete with advice for minimizing temptations afforded by female penitents. Raymond of Peñafort instructed the priest to make a woman sit across from him but to avoid looking into her face (*Summa de poenitentia* 3.34.30, pp. 464–65). By Antoninus of Florence's time, women were to be confessed only in public with witnesses. Strict time limits were to be imposed on women "who wish to confess excessively frequently . . . [the priest should] always use harsh and rigid words toward them rather than gentle" (*Confessionale Anthonini* 3.11 [Paris: Jehan Petit, 1507?], fol. 28r). Antoninus further condemns priests who hear daily confessions (fol. 28v). Cf. John Nider's *Confessionale seu manuale confessorum fratris Johannis Nyder ad instructionem spiritualem pastorum valde necessarium* 2.1, 6th rule (Paris: Jehan Petit, n.d.), unpaginated.

[136] Gerson, *De remediis*, in *Oeuvres*, 10:378.

[137] Gerson, *Poetimini: Contre la luxure*, in *Oeuvres*, 7,2:828. Gerson also explicitly condemns the priest whose carnal lust interferes with God's work—for instance, a confessor who prefers certain penitents on the basis of looks, age, or gender (*De signis bonis et malis*, 9:166). Cf. John of Freiburg's advice to the penitent who plainly sees the lust his or her confession excites on the face of the priest (*Summa confessorum* bk. 3, tit. 34, q. 81 [Rome: n.p., 1518], fol. 192r).

[138] Gerson, to an unknown recipient, but perhaps Peter d'Ailly, in *Oeuvres*, 2:21; trans. Brian McGuire, *Jean Gerson: Early Works* (New York: Paulist Press, 1998), p. 165.

[139] John Nider, *Consolatorum timorate conscientie* (Paris: Jehan Petit, 1502?) 3.4–5 (unpaginated).

[140] Ibid. 3.2.

[141] Ibid. 3.16; cf. 3.15.

[142] Ibid. 3.2.

[143] Nider, *Formicarium* 2.12, pp. 175–76; cf. an instance concerning a monk (pp. 176–77).

[144] Ibid. 2.12, p. 173–74; cf. a case concerning a widow (pp. 175–76).

[145] John of Marienwerder, *Septililium B. Dorotheae* 7.4, ed. Franz Hipler, *AB*

4 (1885): 247.

[146] Ibid., p. 248. Christ also insists on confession in a public place. Cf. John's similar rationale for transcribing Dorothea's revelations only in open areas of the church (idem, *Vita Dorotheae* 1.7, p. 50).

[147] John of Marienwerder, *Septililium* 7.5, p. 249.

[148] Dorothea's austerities may have substantially interfered with her children's health. (Only one of her nine children survived.) This perhaps makes the case for her projection upon the nameless female penitent who inadvertently killed her child all the stronger. On Dorothea's self-mortification when nursing, see Elliott, *Spiritual Marriage*, p. 230. On the unnerving parallels between interrogation of penitents and heretics, see Annie Cazenave, "Aveu et Contrition: Manuels de confesseurs et interrogatoires d'inquisition en Languedoc et en Catalogne (XIIIe–XIVe sie`cles)," in *La Pi è te é populaire au Moyen Age*, Actes du 99e congre`s national des Sociétés Savantes, Bescan ç on, 1974 (Paris: Bibliothe`que Nationale, 1977), pp. 333–52.

[149] Cf. chap. 1, p. 26, above; also note the distinction between the seal of confession and the seal of secrecy.

[150] Zanchino Ugolini, *Tractatus de haereticis*, in *Tractatus universi iuris*, ed. Camillo Campeggi (Venice: Franciscus Zilettus, 1584), vol. 11, pt. 2, c. 34, fol. 264r; Lorenzo Paolini, ed., *Il "De officio inquisitionis": La procedura inquisitoriale a Bologna e a Ferrara nel Trecento* (Bologna: Editrice Universitaria Bolognina, 1976), 1:80, 141. Raymond of Peñafort's consultation with the bishop of Tarragona was more clement. See chap. 1, p. 27, above.

[151] William of Auvergne, *De sacramentis* (= *De sacramento poenitentiae*) c. 3, in *Opera*, 1:461; cf. 486; also William's earlier *Tractatus novus de poenitentiae* of ca. 1223, where he outlines a similar plan (c. 1, in *Opera*, 1:571). Also see Nicole Bériou, "La confession dans les écrits théologiques et pastoraux du XIIIe sie`cle: médication de l' â me ou démarche judiciare," in *Aveu*, pp. 275–76. Much of what follows in this section is an expansion upon Elliott, "Women and Confession," pp. 48–51.

[152] See, for example, the testimony of Petra de Alzate and Katella de Gioziis, who sought out the inquisitors and confessed spontaneously, without having been cited, in Marina Benedetti, ed., *Milano 1300: I processi inquisitoriali contro le devote e i devoti di santa Guglielma* (Milan: Libri Scheiwiller, 1999), pp. 116–18.

[153] See Gerson, *De confessione castitatis*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:63.

[154] See the translation of her testimony in Elizabeth Petroff's *Women's Visionary Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 284–90.

[155] *Anecdotes* no. 227, p. 196.

[156] Bernard Gui, *Practica inquisitionis hereticae* 2.7, ed. Célestin Douais (Paris: Alphonse Pi-card, 1886), pp. 43–44. The individual was still required to do penance for the ensuing scandal.

[157] For her concern regarding the authenticity of her visions, which precipitated her consultation of the inquisitor in Toulouse, see Noeïl Valois, ed., "Les révélations de Constance de Rabastens et le schisme d'occident" 2.19–20, *Annales du Midi* 8 (1986): 256–57. The inquisitor forbade her to record any further revelations, at which point she countered with a series of letters insisting on the legitimacy of her revelations and coupled with ominous predictions of his death (pp. 275–77). See Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, "Constance de Rabastens: Politics and Visionary Experience in the Time of the Great Schism," *Mystics Quarterly* 25 (1999): 147–68, esp. 151, 160–61, and AndréVauchez, *The Laity in the Middle Ages: Religious Beliefs and Devotional Practices*, trans.

158 See Dronke's discussion of her case in *Women Writers of the Middle Ages*, pp. 213–14.

159 Jean Duvernoy, ed., *Le Registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier, è ve ê que de Pamiers (1318–1325)* (Toulouse: E. Privat, 1965), Auda, wife of Guillelmus Fabri de Muro Veteri, 2:83; see her emendation, 2:94.

160 Ibid., p. 83; see her emendation, p. 84.

161 Ibid., p. 94.

162 Ibid. Cf. the predicament of Maria daughter of Petrus de Seravale from the inquisition in Bologna, whose voice became constricted every time she tried to say the Pater Noster (Lorenzo Paolini and Raniero Orioli, eds., *Acta S. Officii Bononie: ab anno 1291 usque ad annum 1310* [Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, 1982–84], 1:42).

163 Duvernoy, *Le Registre*, Auda, 2:83–84. Heightened indignation was clearly employed by witnesses to affirm their orthodoxy. By his account, Guillelmus told Auda that she was was lost and that the devil would carry her away body and soul (2:86). Ermengardis claims to have called Auda "traitress" (2:87, 88), while others describe Ermengardis's reaction as still more vehement. See n. 166, below.

164 Ibid., Guillelmus Fabri, 2:86.

165 Ibid., Ermengardis Garauda de Muro Veteri, 2:88.

166 The fact that one had the title *magister* further suggests that William was on the lookout for credible witnesses. Before revealing Auda's error, Ermengardis made each of them take an oath secrecy—unless they had the leave of the said Guillelmus (ibid., Guillelmus de Infirmaria, 2:89). These witnesses all claim that when Auda revealed her error, Ermengardis immediately responded with " 'To the fire, to the fire!' " as does Guillelmus (Guillelmus de Infirmaria, 2:89; Magister Gaufridus Scriptor, 2:90; Bernardus de Querio, 2:91; Iohannes de Monte Ventoso, 2:92).

167 Ibid., Auda, 2:95.

168 Ibid., Aladaycis, widow of Arnaldus Gamicii de Muro Veteri, 2:97; Ramunda, widow of Petrus Gamicius de Muro Veteri, 2:97–98; Guillelma de Athone, daughter of Arnauldus de Athone, 2:98–99.

169 Ibid., 2:98, 99. The same phrase is used to describe Mary of Oignies's scrupulous searching of her memory. See chap. 2, p. 52, above. Auda's imprisonment during her trial is mentioned in passing (ibid., Magister Gaufridus Scriptor, 2:90).

170 Nicolas Eymeric, *Directorium inquisitorium . . . denuo ex collatione plurium exemplorum emendatum, et accessione multarum literarum Apostolicarum* (Rome: In aedibus Pop. Rom., 1578), pt. 2, q. 6, p. 178; pt. 2, q. 2, p. 173.

171 Duvernoy, *Le Registre*, 2:99.

172 Ibid., Aladaycis, 2:100–101; cf. the later episode, Auda, 2:98.

173 Angela of Foligno, *Il libro della Beata Angela* 1.1, pp. 132–33; trans. Lachance, p. 124; Margery Kempe, *The Book of Margery Kempe* 1.1, 1.3, ed. Sanford Meech and Hope Allen, *EETS*, o.s., no. 212 (London: Oxford University Press, 1940), pp. 6–7, 12.

174 For shame over an incubus lover, see Caesarius of Heisterbach (*Dialogus miraculorum* 3.9, 1:121–22; trans. Scott and Bland, 1:136–37; 3.42, 1:162; trans. 1:182). Lutgard cures a nun of embarrassment so she can confess a hidden sin, but also performs the same service for a man (*VLA*, p. 202; trans. King, p. 64). Also see Jean Gobi, *La Scala coeli* nos. 249, 268, ed. Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1991), pp. 269–70, 278. In exempla a woman's unconfessed sin often concerns motherson incest (Elizabeth Archibald, *Incest and the Medieval Imagination*

[Oxford: Clarendon, 2001], pp. 133–44).

175 Ep. 24, to an unnamed bishop, in *Oeuvres*, 2:90–93; trans. McGuire, pp. 240–44.

176 Special treatises were dedicated to penitents preparing for confession. See, for example, *Tractatus breuis: penitentibus tamen utilis. de modo confessionis. ac et inquisitionibus faciendis de peccatis*, Bodleian MS 555, fols. 109r ff. This English manuscript, written ca. 1400, belonged to an Augustinian house.

177 John of Freiburg, *Summa confessorum* bk. 3, tit. 34, q. 85, fol. 193v. God performs the same function for Dorothea of Montau, furthering the conflation between God and confessor—John of Marienwerder (Dyan Elliott, "Authorizing a Life: The Collaboration of Dorothea of Montau and John Marienwerder," in *Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and Their Interpreters*, ed. Catherine Mooney [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999], pp. 177–78).

178 Raymond of Peñafort, *Summa de poenitentia* 3.34.28, p. 463; Gui, *Practica* bk. 5, prologue, p. 236; trans. *WE*, p. 378.

179 Ugolini, *Tractatus* c. 33, 1, fol. 263v; cf. Gerson, *De arte audiendi confessionis*, in *Oeuvres*, no. 7, 8:11 ff., trans. McGuire, pp. 368 ff.; Antoninus of Florence, *Confessionale* pt. 3, c. 2, fols. 23r–v. This may be empty rhetoric: Michaud-Quantin argues that little effort was made to convince or convert the heretic ("La conscience," p. 49).

180 Duvernoy, *Le Registre*, Auda, 2:83.

181 Ibid., p. 85.

182 Ibid., p. 95. The assembly of the wise practically all concurred that her penance be private and noninfamous (p. 102; for her sentence, see pp. 103–4).

183 Richer, *Gesta* 4.18, pp. 307–8. The episode described above is translated in Charles Homer Haskins, "Robert le Bougre and the Beginnings of the Inquisition in Northern France," in *Studies in Mediaeval Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929), pp. 225–26. It may allude to Robert's 1236 persecution of the matron Petronilla of La Charité, whom he accused of heresy but refused to acquit even after her canonical compurgation. She eventually appealed successfully to the pope (Auvray, 10 April 1236, no. 3106). On Robert, also see chap. 2, n. 94, above.

184 See Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book II*, trans. Sylvana Tomaselli (New York: Norton, 1992), esp. pp. 191–205, 196–97. See Jonathan Elmer's analysis in *Reading the Social Limit: Affect, Mass Culture, and Edgar Allan Poe* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), pp. 192–201.

185 Cf. the recent revelation of the false confession made by the supposed perpetrator in the notorious Central Park Jogger case (see Saul Kassin's article in the *New York Times*, 1 November 2002). Amnesty International has also been alerted to this danger. See Edwin Dobb's "False Confessions: Scaring Suspects to Death," in *Amnesty Now* 28, 4 (2002): 6–9, 28. False confession is treated at length in Peter Brooks, *Troubling Confessions: Speaking Guilt in Law and Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

PART 3

The Discernment of Spirits

Chapter Six

Clerical Quibbles

> Satan, the crafty instigator, deposed from his seat,
>
> uses
>
> the traps of the sophists; he hides and pursues many things. He hides sometimes under the guise of atheologian,
>
> sometimes a preacher, sometimes a confessor,sometimes a religious, sometimes a hermit, sometimes a prelate, and thus he turns himself into the appearance of
>
> whatsoever state. He has a thousand names and athousand
>
> arts [*artes*] of harming. In the beginning, the crafty instigator pretended he was a theologian in the form of
>
> an astute serpent; he spoke to Eve about God in
>
> guile.[1]
>
> (John Gerson)

AS THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY drew to a close, the realms of sanctity and heresy seemed to be caving in on one another. I have suggested certain ways in which the inquisitional procedure might have facilitated this gradual collapse. But the pressures it exerted to this end were corroborated by the methods of inquiry that prevailed in the universities of the period and the kind of problems to which they were applied. The scholastic argument, or *disputatio*, and its implied approach to its subject matter bear some striking parallels with the inquisitional procedure.[2] This should come as no surprise. It was not an accident that a formal proof in an inquisition into sanctity, such as the one undertaken by Peter of Colonna for Saint Louis IX, so easily lent itself to a disputational format.[3] Like the inquisitional procedure, the scholastic methodology had important twelfth-century antecedents, but its formalization was a phenomenon of the first half of the thirteenth century. As with the *inquisitio*, it was then refined and popularized by the mendicant orders. The parallels between both the structure and the internal logic of the two procedures, moreover, are remarkably symmetrical. In the *disputatio*, a scholar first isolates an area of investigation in the form of a proposition, which is presented as a *quaestio*. The *quaestio* is then interrogated so that two opposing sides emerge. One line of argument will attempt to support the proposition, while the other will attempt its refutation.

Let us for a moment regard the proposition itself as the defendant in an *inquisitio* undertaken for whatever purpose. The argument in favor of the proposition corresponds to an argument for the defense, while

the opposing position (often heralded by *sed contra* or a similar phrase) represents the prosecution. If the question under discussion was first debated publicly, say, as a *quaestio disputata* or *quaestio de quolibet*, these roles might be divided between the master, his students, and some colleagues. But in the early public debates at least, the master seems to have marshaled the arguments for both pro and contra. And this level of magisterial control may have continued as more the rule than the exception.[4] Certainly by the time the *quaestio* achieves its written form the master plays every role: not only is he cast as procurator for defense and prosecution alike; he simultaneously inhabits the role of judge, who pronounces the *determinatio*.[5] In this comprehensive capacity, then, the master is akin to the inquisitor of heretical depravity, who combines the roles of prosecutor and judge. But in the scholastic question this similar conflation, with its incumbent bias toward the rejection (or, rather, condemnation) of a given position, becomes even more pronounced, since the master is ultimately responsible for the defense of the proposition as well. In essence, he is creating a fallible defense designed for refutation, rendering the case for the prosecution virtually unassailable.

Yet the similarities between the two kinds of inquiries go beyond these structural features. Scholastic and inquisitional personnel alike are praised and blamed for the dialectical and rhetorical techniques they employ en route to their respective ends. Thus in scholasticism's early days, Peter the Chanter (d. 1197) will liken certain theologians to sophists, use lessly grappling with meaningless abstractions.[6] Scholars increasingly turned to the use of formal *sophismata* in their logical works, with the ultimate result that such methods were officially condemned at the University of Paris in the fourteenth century.[7] Nicolas Eymeric, when discussing the most effective use of torture, encouraged the inquisitor to employ the "many licit tricks [*cautelas*]," a number of which were verbal maneuvers, to provoke a confession. Individuals tried for heresy testify to the success of the inquisitor's verbal traps: thus Isabella of Bourges, one of the Beguins of Narbonne, fled from her initial summons before the inquisitional tribunal, having already heard "what the lord inquisitor, saying subtle things [*subtilia dicens*], sought from those whom he captured or caused to be captured."[8] For the Beguin notary Bernardus Sabri, the sin of the "carnal church" entailed a sophistical (*sophistice*) dismissal of Christ's manner of life, which was to live in poverty.[9] Ecclesiastical authorities also tended to portray their various opponents as debased academics, constantly engaged in wily wordplay. This chapter's first two epigraphs, one above and the other below, present us with a theologizing Satan, whose technique was replete with sophistical

traps, while heretics, as agents of the devil, were understood to mirror their dark master. Stephen of Bourbon claims that Cathars can be known by their *sophisticacio*, which exceeds that of the greatest master in Paris. According to Bernard Gui, many heretics escape "by verbal trickery and carefully contrived subtleties [*fallacias verborum et per excogitatas astucias*] . . . slipping carefully out of their [the inquisitors'] hands by the sly cunning and tortuous ambiguities of their replies [*per suas vulpinas, versucias et tortuosas responsionum ambages callide*]."[10]

Inquisition and scholasticism even partake of the same vocabulary to describe their various stages and goals. Both scholarly and inquisitional agendas are driven by the need to prove (*probare*) certain contentions. Such proof is elicited through various articles (*articuli*) of interrogation. Both pursuits also generate sentences (*sententiae*) at the end of their respective inquiries. Naturally in the context of trials for heresy, these terms become much more than mere mechanisms for gathering abstract truths, designating practices that color the terminology with somber hues. This is nowhere truer than in the key terms for torture: to put someone to the question (*quaestio*) and, less frequently, "to prove" (*probare*) someone—a hideous exercise practiced on the joints (*articuli*) of the accused. Hence Bernard Gui encourages inquisitors to extract confessions and the names of confederates through "the torments of questions [*per questionum tormenta*]," while Nicolas Eymeric cautions the inquisitor not to be too eager "to question someone [*ad quaestionandum aliquem*]."[11]

Thus the scholastic *disputatio* can be regarded as but another version of the *inquisitio*, epitomizing the unmistakable vector toward "incrimination" of a given proposition that is latent in inquisitional procedure. Moreover, given its bias toward the condemnation of a certain article, the *disputatio* is not unlike the modern detective novel or, better still, its spin-off—a courtroom drama. With the verdict preordained, the same side always wins, while the other side is time and again defeated. Nevertheless, it is essential that the ritualized fiction of two competing sides be maintained. In fact, the seeming stability of this classroom drama is illusory. While the scholar may appear undisputed master of this particular exercise, his apparent control extends no further than the narrow confines of the *quaestio* that he has posed and resolved. He can never master the discursive implications of his own argument; other scholars can and will disagree with him. The ecclesiastical authorities may also condemn some of his contentions: far from exploring and proving the various mysteries of the faith, he might end up defending himself against charges of heresy.[12] But most important for our purposes is the possibility, or even the likelihood, of a complete reversal of any scholarly conclusion. For if the inquisitional procedure has the potential to unite

the extremes of sanctity and heresy by what I have described as a covert bridge, this is even more apparent in the case of scholasticism. Now, however, the bridge is no longer covert, but entirely exposed and available for anyone to traverse. Another scholar would, as a matter of course, gather the discarded contentions that had been designed by their originator for the refutation of a given thesis and use them to argue the opposite view.

These considerations are extremely important as we explore the fate of female mysticism in the later Middle Ages, which would be affected by developments in the scholarly world—both indirectly and directly, formally and discursively. On a formal level, female revelations will increasingly be examined through the lens of the hostile, inquisitional techniques of scholastic methodology. On a general discursive level, unnerving developments in theology, particularly discussions about God's potential for deceiving humanity, not only articulated certain contemporary anxieties about salvation but would have the effect of casting a long shadow of doubt over all subsequent supernatural communications. This scholarly debate certainly coincided with, and perhaps even to some extent precipitated, a tendency toward increased surveillance of a mystic's or visionary's communications with God. Although recognizing the impossibility of contriving an infallible method for assessing the integrity of what appeared to be divine communications, scholars nevertheless strove to develop mechanisms that would ensure the highest degree of security available, an impetus responsible for the flourishing of treatises on spiritual discernment.

GOD THE TRICKSTER IN ENGLAND

It happened, moreover, that on a certain day Master Albert [the Great] wished to have a quodlibetal ispute

in the schools; and he imagined that neither a human nor an angel would be able to trap him [*sibi concludere*]. . . .And a certain youth entered the schools in the semblance of a scholar and greeted the master, saying: "What is the disputation about?" He answered: "It's a quodlibet." Then the scholar said: "On which point of the disputation are you?" He answered: "Concerning angels." And he said: "Therefore you should answer about angels, Master." And the scholar presented Albert with three arguments of such profundity that the master did not understand, nor did he know how to respond. The disputation ended. All were to return the next day. That night after matins the master went through the cloister thinking about the arguments of the scholar, and he heard a voice saying: "You have thought enough, Master. For I, one of the lesser demons in hell, trapped you [*conclusi*]

in order to humble your heart. Here is the center of the argument." As soon as the master heard that, he immediately understood the solution of the arguments. And the next day, he reported back and told the whole thing to all the others in the schools. (Jacobus ab Aquis, *Chronicon imaginis mundi*)[13]

I suggested earlier that, from a certain perspective, the scholar was a type of inquisitor. But other interesting analogues also present themselves. Our two epigraphs, the one at the beginning of this chapter and the one directly above, convey a different analogy, inviting us to consider the scholar as a type of demon. There is much to be said for this view. Lucifer fell on account of pride, a failing that Albert is portrayed as sharing, and that is frequently considered a particular vice of scholars, in keeping with the Pauline dictum that too much learning only inflates an individual (1 Cor. 8.1). One could further aver that scholars and demons have similar vocations. Thus Aquinas, in response to the question whether "tempting is the special job of demons," will answer: "Properly speaking, to tempt is to put someone to the test so as to find out something about him. Hence the immediate goal of any tempter is knowledge."[14] Demon and scholar alike are duty-bound to put someone or something to the test in the pursuit of knowledge. Indeed, this function can be further expanded to include many other clerical roles already examined, such as inquisitor (testing for an individual's true identity as saint or heretic), or the confessor seeking to promote the cult of his penitent (testing for the validity of supernatural marvels manifested).[15]

For Gerson, the devil is noted for his sophistical use of scholastic argumentation. This representation is on a continuum with Gerson's ongoing rebuke of scholars who become too wrapped up in novelties, exploring newfangled and often dangerous metaphysical byways. The scholar-demon who challenges Albert, however, poses an unanswerable question that baffles the master himself. Yet the story has a happy ending. For while Albert is temporarily humbled, he not only learns the correct answer but learns it in time for the magisterial *determinatio*, which traditionally occurs on the day after the first session of the quodlibet.[16] Moreover, since it is a question that concerns angels, and Albert is the fortunate beneficiary of a native informant, the answer may even be correct—always bearing in mind that the devil is the father of lies (John 8.44). But the anecdote also lends itself to a less sanguine reading, one that brings it into alignment with Gerson's concerns. More sober scholars recognized and warned against certain theological issues that constituted dangerous inquiries, often spawning heretical outcomes.[17] A *quaestio*, once posed, could stir up attendant problems that might encourage one set of scholars to articulate what others would deem unthinkable. On a

tacit level, then, the exemplum might suggest that there are certain questions that should not be asked—questions that could be answered only by a demon.

My rather moralistic reading of Albert's quodlibetal chastisement, effected through a seemingly unanswerable question, may approximate the way William of Ockham (d. 1347) was regarded by many of his contemporaries. Ockham's firm insistence on the absolute power of God is traditionally construed as the single most important factor in the collapse of the optimistic collaboration between faith and reason that characterized thirteenth-century scholasticism. From an Ockhamite perspective, God's absolute power meant that he could not be constrained by rules—a proposition that, if accepted, would necessarily undermine past speculation on God's salvific plan for humanity. Thus when the question presented itself as to whether God could make something appear to the senses that did not in fact exist, Ockham concedes this as a possibility—despite its ramifications for the integrity of God's dealing with humankind.[18] But Ockham himself treated the proposition of a God who could baffle through illusion only in the course of a discussion on intuitive versus abstract knowledge.[19] Subsequent scholars would walk through the door opened by Ockham's inquiry, considering the question of a deceptive God more pointedly and in isolation.[20] Soon God's liberty would expand further to accommodate the potential for God to plant false thoughts in an individual's mind or even voluntarily to will someone to err.[21]

The English scholar Robert Holkot (d. 1349) was very much alive to the possibilities that this new perspective on God opened up, and he devotes a lengthy article to the Ockhamite problem, now bluntly recast as "Whether God is able to deceive someone." At the outset of the article, Robert cheerfully asserts that God is fully capable of deception, but there are ethical limits: "he cannot deceive unjustly, or through a fault of his own, or inordinately [*deordinate*]."[22] Robert outlines the theoretical underpinnings of divine deception: whenever God deals in contingencies, whether describing or predicting an event that could change or not come true, he is, in a sense, deceiving;[23] since God is the first and last cause of everything, one could additionally argue that every error is from God;[24] the many effects that God is capable of working on the mind (*in mente humana*) through mediation, including the activities usually allotted to an evil angel, could be accomplished by God himself.[25] Robert adduces a suggestive set of biblical examples indicating God's capacity to deceive. Thus the twelve-year-old Christ was acting deceptively when he purposefully eluded Mary in order to remain in Jerusalem with the doctors of the temple (Luke 2.42–49).[26] God ordered Abraham to immolate his son,

a command that, as it later turns out, was made under false pretenses (Gen. 22.1–12). Peter was doubtlessly deceived through a divine vision, wherein he saw a vessel containing certain animals descending from the heaven (Acts 10.11–12), and again when he was released from prison by an angel (Acts 12.7). In each of these cases, he was tricked into mistaking spiritual forms for corporeal ones. God inspired the Magi to steal away from Herod, although they had promised to return, thus making good men deceive evil ones (Matt. 2.12). The Christ who appeared on the road to Emmaus seemed to mislead the apostles purposefully (Luke 24.13). Then there are the many other instances of angels deceptively appearing in assumed bodies throughout the Old Testament.[27]

The doctrine concerning the simulated bodies of angels—among the strongest evidence adduced by Robert and other scholars who argue in favor of a deceptive God—was directly indebted to the thirteenth century's fascination with angelology. (It is no accident that Albert's demonic quodlibet was on angels.) Thirteenth-century theologians had finally broken with the equivocation of past tradition by pronouncing that angels were entirely incorporeal, a quality Robert exploits to its full advantage. Thus all angels, good and bad, relied on dissemblance in their dealings with humanity since the very bodies they assumed were constituted from borrowed matter—only the semblances of semblances and hence doubly illusory.[28] But if angels and demons, mere created beings, could and did make things seem to appear that were not actually there, it was impossible to deny this ability to the creator, since "God is not of lesser power than the devil or a jester; but they can make appear that which is not and make one thing become another"—a point made in no uncertain terms by one of Robert's contemporaries.[29]

As the creator's capacity for deception expanded under Robert, the usually generous scope for culpability that was the lot of his creatures proportionately dwindled. And this is as one would expect. The kind of arguments that Robert and certain contemporaries deployed had the effect of blunting the sharp edges distinguishing God from his wayward agents, the demons. Moreover, with a God who was prepared to exercise his absolute power by befuddling the fallible senses of his creatures, who could blame them for the errors that might ensue from their simply trusting the testimony of their senses? This line of argument is particularly emphasized by two questions that Robert places in sequence: "Whether one invincibly deluded by error into worshiping the devil transformed into an effigy of Christ is excused from idolatry by such ignorance" and "Whether someone is able to win merit through false faith."[30]

Robert's questions, in essence, pit an individual's conscience against

an objective assessment of error.We have seen the way in which an erroneous conscience can entrap the scrupulous, thus extending the usual ambit for sin considerably. But what if the promptings of conscience actually contradict the faith? Aquinas, who dedicated two quodlibets to the problem of erroneous conscience, is intransigent on this issue: “Every conscience, whether right or wrong, is obligatory—either in evil things per se or indifferent things; so that whoever acts against conscience sins.”[31] A heretic who disregards the dictates of his or her conscience and agrees to take an oath—an act not sinful in itself—is still guilty of sin, but formal rather than material sin. Even in the extreme instance where conscience and orthodoxy are at odds, the individual in question sins by not following the dictates of conscience. And yet despite the manifold traps that such a doctrine might spring on a well-intentioned soul, Aquinas was not prepared to compromise over what constituted sin and error. After posing the prickly question of whether adhering to a heretical belief could be a pious act of faith, Aquinas refutes this possibility with vigor. Adherence in this context lacks the virtue of faith. A heretic’s adherence is but to a false faith, even as a bad Christian’s adherence is to a deformed faith. Thus the acts of tenacity inspired by such a faith are only apparent, not true acts of faith. Moreover, even as adherence to the true faith lends strength to God’s spiritual edifice, adherence to a false faith assists in building a diabolical abode.[32]

When Aquinas penned this answer, he was writing in an intellectual environment in which God was still clearly on the side of humanity—a God one could trust. But half a century later, matters were no longer so unequivocal. Thus the reasoning of someone like Robert Holkot, newly apprised of the negative capacities that the very idea of a deceptive God promoted, seems more sympathetic to human frailty. As a result he pronounces in the affirmative with respect to both the questions “Whether one invincibly deluded by error into worshiping the devil transformed into an effigy of Christ is excused from idolatry by such ignorance” and “Whether someone is able to win merit through false faith.”

Robert’s first contention achieves instant relevance by virtue of the historical circumstances in which the question is posed: the visionary climate of the later Middle Ages when sightings of Christ were frequent.[33] According to Robert, an individual suffering such deception not only evades sin but actually wins the same merit that would have been accorded had he or she been adoring Christ himself. As proof, Robert adduces a hypothetical situation in which Peter and John, two good men, are both confronted by what is ostensibly the humanity of Christ. Both do what they can to assure themselves that the revelation is authentic. Peter’s apparitional visitor turns out to be

the genuine article. John, however, is not so fortunate. And yet Robert is prepared to credit John with the intention of worshiping Christ.

> That effigy by which the devil appears to John may be the humanity of Christ . . . if God permits it; and John believes that it is the humanity of Christ: and he adores him by genuflecting and kissing his feet; then according to that rationale it is necessary to concede that he adores the humanity of Christ. And thus one ought to concede that he touched the body of Christ in the sky.[34]

Basically, Robert is advancing but another version of the orthodox view articulated by Hostiensis and others that prayers to false saints are nonetheless credited by God. From this perspective neither Peter nor John was worshiping the devil; they were both worshiping God. Either John participates in the merit accorded to Peter, or Peter is implicated in the error of John.[35]

Robert's generous appreciation of the evils occasioned by an erroneous conscience is wielded in a way that would have seemed inconceivable to Aquinas and his generation of scholars. Although Robert is fully apprised of the double bind of the erroneous conscience, he consistently privileges it over the taint associated with whatever error the misguided conscience instills.[36] Thus John, believing as he did, would have committed a mortal sin had he refused to worship the visionary Christ. A gloss on 2 Corinthians 2 supports this position: that when Satan transforms himself into an angel of light, he deceives only the bodily senses, without necessarily moving the mind from the true faith.[37] Furthermore, granting that erroneous conscience ought to be deposed, Robert nevertheless contends that as long as a strong conviction continues to urge an individual toward error, erroneous conscience has the same claims as right-minded conscience.[38] By the same token, the pagan philosophers' object of worship could be accredited in their favor since it was their intention to worship the one God.[39] Robert's discussion concludes with genuine éclat: if Christ had decided to set aside his humanity without telling the Virgin Mary, and she (unaware of any change) continued to worship him as before, Mary would likewise win merit through her misapprehension. Moreover, true to his post-Ockhamite lineage, Robert denies the contention of his alleged opponent, who apparently maintained that God would necessarily inform the Virgin Mary of such a change in her son's persona. Such necessity, however, contradicts the principle of God's absolute power.[40]

Thus Robert dazzles the reader by applying his defense of individuals beset by an erroneous conscience to the dramatic examples

of the apostles and even Christ's mother, and then extends his argument to accommodate pagans—an accommodation that certainly challenges the entire rationale for religious persecution, and possibly for the church militant. His subsequent question, "Whether someone is able to win merit through false faith," is a prolongation of that impetus. The personae peopling Robert's hypothesis, however, shift away from biblical celebrities to the mundane and parochial. Supposing some old woman (*aliquam vetulam*) heard her prelate preach a heretical article, such as the belief that Christ received the lance in his side before his death?—a conviction that was, incidentally, shared among the Beguins of southern France.[41] The woman trusted entirely in what she heard, and held fast to what she construed as the orthodox faith. Could she thereby win merit? Robert's veritable catalog of biblical as well as more ordinary personages who won merit through error constitutes a powerful testimonial: Mary Magdalene mistaking Christ for a gardener; the other apostles' love for Judas; a judge crediting a dishonest testimony over the protestations of an innocent man; the ecclesiastical courts crediting false witness that seeks to portray a faithful wife as an adulteress; Lot receiving angels as men; a putative father raising a child that is not his own out of ignorance; a layperson adoring an unconsecrated host; an individual who is self-baptized believing this gesture sufficient for salvation.[42] And this is only a sampling. Robert concludes with the firm assurance that "it ought to be said that an old woman wins merit in believing heresy that can in no way be imputed to her."[43]

GOD THE TRICKSTER IN FRANCE

> Another type of melancholia which afflicts the French is that they believe they are roosters and cry out
>
> just like roosters [*galli*]. Whence they are said to be from Gaul [*agalli*]. But the elements of this ancient affliction ought not to be imputed to the English, for [Gaul] was named the land of roosters and hens.(Anonymous medical treatise from an
>
> English manuscript)[44]

One cannot help but observe that questions bearing on God's capacity to deceive, and other attendant propositions developing around this central premise, first arose in the British Isles. This may come as a surprise in view of the fact that it was the Continent that was more experienced in the culture of visions, visionaries, and heretical beliefs. (And these challenges to a stable perception of reality doubtless inspired the writer cited in the epigraph to satirize the French as prone to a melancholia that produces a delusional identification with

poultry.) Yet this sequence makes sense from the perspective of cost: perhaps the Continent could not afford this line of speculation, whether on a psychological or a social level. This hypothesis is sustained by the fact that when such intellectual strains did reach the Continent, they were attended by vigorous efforts at suppression. There were at least two statutes issued by the University of Paris condemning Ockhamite thought, first in 1339 and again in 1340.45 Moreover, the articles that a university commission extracted and condemned fromthe work of the Cistercian monk John ofMirecourt in 1347 clearly indicate an Ockhamite inflected line of questioning. Under the implied banner of God's absolute power, John's contentions pointed to howthis power might manifest itself in a manner hitherto unimaginable: that Christ was able to have said and asserted a falsity through both mental and vocal assertion (art.2); that it is possible that Christ erred according to his created will and, according to his human side, perhaps proffered a lie (art. 3); that God could make someone sin and, because he requires this, it is pleasing to the divine will that this individual is a sinner (art. 10); that no one who sins in any way wishes or does otherwise than God wills him, so that when anyone sins, it is done with God's approval and he causes the person to sin (art. 12); that God causes evil and sin, while the sinner is willing and makes this sin occur (art. 14); that sin is more good than bad (art. 15); that God is the cause of sin so that it is a sin, or the cause of the fault of evil so that it is evil, and the author of sin so that it is a sin (art. 34).[46] The university would likewise compel a certain Augustinian friar named Giles of Mantes to renounce his views in 1354. Fretting under his sense of God's predestinary capacity, Giles had posited, among other things, that God can hinder an individual in the performance of a good act—a natural analogue to the views attributed to John of Mirecourt.[47]

But the concept of a deceptive deity proved irrepressible, surfacing almost fifty years later in the work of Peter d'Ailly (d. 1420). Moreover, Peter was hardly a marginal figure, assuming the position of chancellor of the University of Paris and confessor to the king of France in 1389, and ending his career as a cardinal. Yet not only does Peter affirm God's ability to deceive; he likewise champions what might be considered the tacit implication that invariably surfaces when this question is raised: the reduced culpability of the individual.With so unpredictable a deity, salvation might be sought through alternative routes:

> Someone who is saved and deserves merit through faith and hope is able to have merited this through infidelity or false judgment. . . .Likewise someone is able to have merited damnation through proper judgment and true faith. . . .

> Whence it is apparent that man does not merit in believing because what is believed by him is true nor does he earn demerit because something is false.[48]

Elsewhere, Peter will likewise defend the position that an unlettered person can win merit by adhering to the heresy preached to him by a prelate. He even entertains the proposition that, since the Jews regarded Christ as a destroyer of the law, they would have sinned by not crucifying him—an issue carried over from Robert Holkot.[49] The view that merit could be gained by false judgment or even infidelity clearly corroborates Robert's defense of an individual who devoutly worships a false Christ.[50] Nor is divine deception reserved for humanity alone: in the course of examining whether a revelation of God is infallible to the human intellect, Peter determines that even the angel Gabriel, the most exalted of God's messengers, can be deceived by God and hence be a vehicle of falsehood.[51]

John Gerson, student and friend to d'Ailly and his immediate successor as chancellor, attempted to direct scholarly energy away from this kind of speculation. For Gerson was not simply hostile to the modes of reasoning associated with the English school; he largely attributed what he perceived as the university's decline to such influence. Indeed, as Zénon Kaluza has demonstrated, Gerson usually reserved what, for him, was the supremely derogatory term of "sophist" for English theologians—a fact that both imparts a certain specificity and corresponds to Gerson's natural anti-English sentiments during the waging of the Hundred Years War.[52] A letter of 1400 to Peter d'Ailly emphasizes the decline in the faculty of theology and broaches the question of reform.[53] His critique is later crystallized in the treatise *Against the Curiosityof Students* (1402)—identifying curiosity and singularity as the daughters of pride, born of the evil mother, envy, and excoriating those who linger over dangerous novelties.[54] Gerson singles out for particular notice the discussions issuing from the concept of the absolute power of God: "But wanting to push further, the scrutinizers failed in their scrutiny. By what means did this happen? Surely because when they attempted to assign and adduce certain rules of necessity to those things that were considered to be within the entirely free power of God, they became vain in their thoughts, and their foolish hearts were darkened (Rom. 1.21)."[55] Later in the same treatise, Gerson compares the current state of affairs to Lactantius's description of certain philosophers who, finding nothing to add to the admirable works of their predecessors, "were turned by malign and proud curiosity and presumed to deny or reduce them to doubt." Such speculation led to heresy.[56] Gerson acknowledges that certain eminences like William of Auvergne found it intolerable that academic speculation should be censured and "the

wisest inquisitors of the truth [*inquisitores veritatis*] should speedily be judged to err." Even so, Gerson believed in stricter surveillance: "But I understand that if the most careful scrutiny is had, their position may become indefensible."[57] Thus the frustrated chancellor repeatedly looks back to the golden age of scholasticism, and Bonaventure in particular, as a paradigmatic remedy.[58]

Gerson's later treatise *On the Examination of Doctrine* (1423) is, as the title suggests, even more insistent on the necessity of monitoring scholarly activity—a matter to be discussed in greater depth in the context of spiritual discernment. For the moment, however, it suffices to note how the treatise posits a still gloomier reading of academic inquiry, generally bringing the entire scholarly enterprise under the umbrella of original sin and the fall of humanity. Thus the scholar's role in interpreting revelation is construed partly as punishment, partly as consolation, and partly as concession to human frailty. And so "God gave the world to the disputation of men (Eccles. 3.11)," Gerson cleverly quips. Past scholars, such as Bonaventure, had succeeded in undertaking their intellectual inquiries with integrity: "he draws away from curiosity, not mixing extraneous positions or secular doctrines, dialectics or obscure philosophies with theological ends, in the manner of many."[59] But Gerson's very nostalgia for the golden age of scholasticism casts doubt not only on the recent endeavors of his excoriated cohort but on his own as well. "The more diligently I've turned to the study [of Bonaventure] in my old age, the more my garrulity becomes confused. And I said to myself: this doctrine is sufficient—by what stupid work are you consumed? What are you saying? What are you writing?"[60]

To Gerson's mind, scholasticism needed reinvigorating; the university needed reforming. A first step must be taken toward tightening surveillance of scholarly activity. But even if monitored more carefully, scholars desperately needed a new direction. One possible route that appealed to Gerson might be dubbed the *via nostalgica*: a retreat to an earlier era of scholasticism. Another was to look inward to contemplation: the *via mystica*. Rather than choosing between the two paths, however, Gerson believed himself to be advancing along both, using the landmarks of the former to orient himself along the latter. And thus, as with all reformers, the interpretation of the past that Gerson brought to bear on the present created something entirely new: a nostalgically inflected, academic mysticism. But before Gerson could turn his students loose upon this road with a clear conscience, the *via mystica* had to be cleared of certain hazards—perilous but intriguing obstructions cast in female form. The immediate task that presented itself entailed nothing less than disassociating mysticism from its contingent of primarily female

lay practitioners and appropriating it for the male world of clerical academe. Gerson's cause would be assisted immensely by a gradual pathologization of female spirituality and an increasing scholarly attention to the discernment of spirits—dramas in which we have seen and will see that he played leading roles.

THE DISCERNMENT OF SPIRITS

Sometimes the soul should not stipulate for a reward in this life lest it be punished in the next for its misdeeds.For there are such consolations of grace conceded gratuitously that can coexist with sin, indeed through which and with which the soul commits fornication against God, just as a queen might fornicate with the beautiful messenger of a king.[61]

(John Gerson)

For Satan transformeth himself into an angel of light.Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers be transformed into ministers of justice.

(2 Cor. 11.14–15)

Spiritual discernment was the ability to distinguish the agency behind spiritual impulses and inspirations. Its exercise was in conformity with the evangelical injunction to "Prove the Spirits—whether they are of God or Satan" (1 John 4.1). But since Paul describes this ability as one of the gifts of the spirit, it was the rare individual who was possessed of this skill. In the early church, when the devil often roamed the earth in different guises, spiritual discernment was a crucial concern. Indeed, in certain celebrated cases the devil attempted the ultimate impostorship by posing as Christ. Most saints worthy of the name passed muster by displaying appropriate skepticism. For instance, when confronted with this test, Martin of Tours acquitted himself by answering, "I will not believe that Christ has come, unless he appears with that appearance and form in which he suffered, and openly displaying the marks of his wounds upon the cross," and the demon was routed, leaving a foul stench in its wake.[62]

In the High Middle Ages, when the devil once again began to walk abroad, spiritual discernment resurfaced as a pressing issue. Thomas of Cantimpréwas privy to many occasions on which demons attempted to pass themselves off as someone else: indeed, his work *On Bees* constitutes something of a primer on the sheer range of demonic virtuosity in this area of deception. Masquerading as a member of the clergy was seemingly a favorite demonic pastime. Some instances of impostorship were relatively benign, even providing a kind of comic relief. Thomas was hence awakened by what he took to be his confrere urinating at the foot of the bed one night. Disgusted, Thomas was about to upbraid him when he realized it was a demon because

he heard his companion snoring beside him.[63] But many demonic impersonations were not so innocuous. For example, the devil was periodically inclined to appear as a confessor (a motif not peculiar to Thomas but common enough that it could be added to our arsenal of confessional ambivalence). Thus a victim of paternal rape, having just given birth, is advised by a demonic monk to cast the baby into a swamp. He then urges the woman to make her confession to him before drowning herself.[64] A demon dressed as a priest tries to inveigle a young boy into making a fraudulent confession and communion on his deathbed.[65] Demons sometimes took on the guise of female religious as well. A noble encounters a Benedictine nun singing in the forest of Westphalia one night. "Believing her to be one of the saints, he said to her: 'I beseech you to tell me what is my future?' She promised the knight a long life ending honorably on Crusade just to ensure that death caught him unawares, taking him when he had done insufficient penance."[66] Demonic simulations could also be extremely elaborate: a Dominican was led by some heretics into a grotto where he was invited to worship a demonic Virgin Mary, flanked by elders and angels—a ruse that he immediately discerned.[67] In view of this proliferation of such compelling illusions, it is no wonder that Thomas cites the Virgin Mary's initial suspicion of the angel Gabriel with approval. His appearance was especially suspect since the supernatural messenger took the form of a man, thereby constituting a potential sexual threat.[68]

Efforts were made to distinguish outer signs that might shed light on the source of inspiration informing various experiences. Strictly speaking, for instance, the angel Gabriel had little option but to assume male form since expert opinion held that good angels invariably appear as men. If an angel took the shape of a woman, that was a sure indicator of its demonic nature.[69] The various aromatic spices that Sybil of Metz saw fit to scatter after her fraudulent raptures reflected the widespread belief that the angelic presence was marked by a beautiful aroma, corresponding to the odor of sanctity.[70] Certainly the many somatic miracles associated with women in this period were considered powerful testimony that the person in question was, indeed, inspired by God. As Sybil herself demonstrated, however, much of this "proof" could be aped by human ingenuity. But supernatural fraud was much more difficult to distinguish. According to Thomas of Cantimpré, for instance, the master general of the Dominican order, Jordan of Saxony (d. 1237), noticed that the most beautiful scent arose whenever he said mass—something that would seem to be a clear-cut sign of the divine presence, that is, "unless perhaps to someone who possessed the discernment of spirits." As a result of this marvel, Jordan no longer desired food, another proof of

holiness, since many of the saints of this period were said to be sustained by the eucharist alone. And yet the "inner palate of his heart discerned that the odor did not furnish spiritual refreshment." When Jordan prayed to God, it was revealed to him that this fragrance was the devil's craft. He thereupon made the sign of the cross and the phenomenon ceased.[71] But Jordan's gifts of discernment were uneven: when the master general visited a Dominican priory in Rome, a demoniac claimed that Jordan's arrival had miraculously cured him. Jordan not only immediately had the demoniac unchained but had a blanket laid for him in his own room. He was awakened that night by the demoniac plying a razor at his throat. As Thomas puts it, tactfully passing over this near fatal instance of spiritual pride, Jordan was rather "too quick to believe the demon."[72]

But undoubtedly one of the most difficult tasks lay in discerning whether a particular individual with a reputation for holiness was in some way corrupted by an evil spirit. For instance, Thomas of Cantimprétells of a simple and good man, living on the borders of Gaul, who became hopelessly dependent on an angelic counselor of the fallen persuasion. Moreover, the man's supernatural visitor left him in a state of such serenity and illumination that many thought the man "an angel among men." Seduced by his fallacious mentor, the man would have committed suicide, had it not been for the timely intervention of his confessor.[73] The condition of rapture could be similarly vitiated. Some theologians, including luminaries like Albert the Great, will entertain the possibility that an individual could be raptured into evil.[74] In fact, to William of Auvergne's mind, there is no doubt that such wicked raptures occurred. Moreover, demonic raptures were initially indistinguishable from the sweet and joyful raptures that the good angels were wont to effect.

> And [the devil] makes this person feel a natural goodness and fulfillment, and hides his malice, just as when he transfigures himself as an angel of light. But because he is not permitted to hide his malice for long, divine providence makes him reveal it, prohibiting him from further deceiving this person, and his harmfulness [*noxietas*] is felt and his malice, and on account of this horror the person feels terror, and [the devil] abandons this quaking, trembling man to whose soul he has attached himself. Meanwhile, the devil is also forced to reveal his own uncleanness, departing with a terrible stench and abominable rottenness.[75]

A certain type of rapture or ecstasy can also be induced for purposes of divination by staring into a mirror, as the ancients apparently practiced with young boys. This process attempts to drive the mind

back on itself, opening it up to evil spirits, an exercise that invariably degenerated into an experience of personal horror ending in sickness or insanity.[76]

Demonic possession probably provided the clearest physical manifestations of Satan's influence. William of Auvergne insists that there are certain telltale signs of demonic habitation in the human body. Evil spirits cause delirium and alienation, outward indications of the pernicious lesions they will leave on the soul.[77] Thus the demoniac is often recognizable by his hoarse voice because demons tend to usurp the vocal cords through violence. Demons are sufficiently ill-adapted to the human form thatWilliam compares their appropriation of the voice with a person's attempting to walk with feet of wood.[78] A demon never enters a body without inflicting damage: when the evil spirit attaches itself to the human soul, the soul cringes at the contact just as it would as a result of touching a snake or some other poisonous creature. At the very least, a demon will leave a permanent expression of horror on the face of the individual from whom he has departed.[79] Thus John Nider recounts an instance in which a novice of thirteen was demonically possessed. Yet the symptoms of his possession were raptures and other external indications of devotion, including a miraculous knowledge of Latin. After exorcism, however, "the boy was again a rustic as before but with a difference: his face took on an unwonted and horrible aspect and such a doltish expression that it was unclear that he could attain the degree of literacy required for the priesthood." 80 In other words, the physical symptoms of the boy's true condition emerged only retrospectively in the stunned expression and reduced mental capacity —far too late to protect either the demoniac from harm or the individuals whose credulity he might have imposed upon.

Fortunately, many holy women of the period were possessed of the gift of discernment. For this reason, Mary of Oignies never doubted the validity of her own visions and frequently exercised her gifts on behalf of her friends.[81] Once when the devil appeared before her disguised as a good shepherd (a visionary allusion to the clergy's pastoral duties), her bristling hair left little doubt as to the true identity of her visitor.[82] The tumultuous spiritual life of Ermine of Reims consisted almost entirely of her correct identification of demonic impostors. In roughly two and a half months, Ermine was presented with an astonishing demonic repertoire of impersonations that included her confessor; her deceased husband (in one instance seeking to exercise his conjugal rights); various compatriots from her hometown; Saints Leger, Andrew, John the Baptist, Mary Magdalene, and Peter; a recently deceased friend; and a host of beautiful angels.[83] Again, she would frequently be apprised of their true natures by

uncontrollable trembling or hair standing on end.[84] Witnesses in the process of Clare of Montefalco describe a demonic illusion that parallels the experience of Saint Francis, who was addressed and converted by a speaking image of Christ on a crucifix.[85] Thus a cult developed around a certain crucifix that supposedly instilled feelings of sweetness and great delectation in its worshipers, even inspiring fraudulent raptures that were followed by antinomian excesses. Clare immediately recognized the image for what it was, however: a cross bearing a crucified demon.[86] An unbearable smell of sulfur assailed Bridget of Sweden when in the presence of any individual under the influence of a diabolical spirit.[87] Joan of Arc also exercised the gift of discernment, exposing the mystic Catherine de la Rochelle as a fraud —an identification that was seconded by her voices.[88] Moreover, the count of Armagnac had written to Joan to ask which of the three men currently claiming to be pope should be obeyed, a question that she left unanswered, as she was just mounting her horse when the letter arrived. But the arcane knowledge that the count sought was a rarefied sort of spiritual discernment, if one grants that the true pope would be invested with the special charisma of the Holy Spirit.[89] The same could be said of Joan's unfailing conviction that the dauphin, the future Charles VII, was the true king of France. Indeed, even a female mystic's miracle par excellence, the ability to distinguish between a consecrated host and its unconsecrated counterpart, should be considered a highly specialized form of discernment.[90]

In short, actual instances of discernment, particularly female discernment, abound for the High and later Middle Ages. The written discourse on discernment, however, lagged far behind the actual practice. After the sixth century, there seems to have been little consideration given to the subject. But with the spiritual reawakening of the High Middle Ages, authors such as Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153) and Richard of Saint Victor (d. 1173) would again take up the question of discernment.[91] In a sermon addressed to a group of nuns, James of Vitry would exhort them to test their religious experiences, cautioning against dreams and revelations as potential snares of the devil.[92] The intense reengagement with the issue, however, occurred in the fourteenth century. Certain female mystics addressed the subject explicitly. For instance, Dorothea of Montau remarks on the way in which the devil can manipulate illness to produce fraudulent raptures.[93] Bridget of Sweden's life and revelations show a particular sensitivity to questions of discernment.[94] But a more systematic approach to discernment was pioneered by a series of important theologians who were trained at the University of Paris and occupied official positions there; this corpus culminated in the works of John Gerson.[95] While clearly responding to a religious climate in which

visions and visionaries were rife, the reappearance of this discourse also corresponds to the possibilities and dangers opened by Ockhamite influences. And yet the proposed remedy was something of a placebo: the Godhead's very freedom and potential duplicity, while creating a need for discernment, simultaneously deny the possibility of its satisfaction.

The three scholars whose writings on spiritual discernment anticipated those of John Gerson were Henry of Friemar (d. 1340), Henry of Langenstein (also called Henry of Hessia, d. 1397), and Peter d'Ailly (d.1420).[96] All of these men would become masters at the University of Paris. In addition, Henry of Friemar served as regent to the university,[97] while we have seen that Peter d'Ailly immediately preceded Gerson as chancellor before his elevation as a cardinal. Their various treatments display considerable independence of spirit. Henry of Friemar's *Treatise on the Four Impulses* presents the different sources of inspiration as fourfold: divine, angelic, diabolical, and natural. Basically, the first two impulses stimulate an increase in virtue, while the last two work to the opposite purpose. But each of these different impulses is easily mistaken for any of the others. With both angelic and diabolical impulses, first impressions tend to be misleading: angelic inspiration disturbs in the first instance (as with Gabriel's address to Mary) but comforts in the end.[98] Diabolical inspiration works in reverse: it is initially reassuring and only gradually begins to reveal its hostile nature. A quintessential example of this latter effect would be in the area of love. Initially, two individuals may be drawn together in an intense bond of spiritual love, which, over time, will reveal its truly carnal foundation.[99] Finally, Henry associates the natural impulse with the kind of arrogance to which scholars would be particularly prone. A person might be prompted to speak rare and subtle things that provoke admiration in others. Yet these grand words are counterproductive in the manner that Saint Paul intonates: knowledge inflates; love edifies. Thus the simpler words proceeding from divine grace are ultimately more fruitful. 100 This same natural impulse leads to complacency and self-congratulation, sapping spiritual devotion and fervor.[101] Indeed, the presumption resulting from insipid philosophical learning ultimately alienates the scholar from himself and from God.[102] On a more local level, natural impulses can disturb meditation by producing a "flux of voluble thoughts";[103] they disrupt prayers through vain curiosity;[104] they introduce counterfeit graces that are not from God but from their own fallen powers.[105] This contrasts with the ideal, wherein both the lower powers of the soul and the appetitive powers connected to the body, which are responsible for these disturbances, would be united under the will and inspired by divine exercises.[106]

Despite gestures in the direction of counterfeit graces and the like, Henry of Friemar thus interprets the impulse of nature largely in terms of scholarly vanity—a focus that anticipates the kind of conflation of scholasticism and mysticism apparent in Gerson's work. Therefore the treatise does not directly engage the kind of physical challenges presented by the body's impingement on spiritual functions. In contrast, Henry of Langenstein's *On the Discernment of Spirits* develops the category of nature as a vehicle for the diagnostic tendency observed in the previous chapter. Our second Henry foregrounds his treatment of discernment by noting the extent to which a person's spiritual leanings are predicated on personal predispositions and circumstances—complexion, position of the planets, health, pregnancy, the passions, or the humoral imbalance afflicting melancholics.[107] For instance, he notes that certain dispositions are more bound to the flesh than others, and thus less susceptible to heightened spiritual conditions.[108] Such an awareness has a distinct tendency to naturalize the supernatural. As a result, Henry by and large passes over the "spiritual delights . . . in contemplations or in the sacrament of the eucharist, etc. . . . or visions" that one might expect would occupy a sizable portion of such a treatise. Instead, he warns those who deem themselves worthy of such extraordinary experiences, and who murmur against God when they are not forthcoming, that sometimes "God permits them to be vexed and tried by the most bitter temptations, into which they fall by their impatience and murmuring. And sometimes God in his anger permits fantastic visions [*phantasticas visiones*] to be sent to them from whatsoever source, and they, who unduly desired to be prophets, become delirious and insane." The demand for spiritual rewards, tantamount to testing God, constitutes a perilous form of spiritual pride.[109] As if to counteract this presumption, Henry's treatise is inclined to de-emphasize supernatural intervention in an individual's life, often reiterating that not every vexation or difficulty is due to demonic influence: there is, after all, such a thing as coincidence.[110] By the same token, he scorns individuals who interpret every outer act that might correspond to their wishes as a miracle.[111] In keeping with this de-emphasis of the extraordinary, all extremes are regarded with suspicion, whether the fanaticism of recent converts or an excessive asceticism that will not be restrained by sound counsel. Ultimately, both corporeal and spiritual powers can become enervated, leading to a kind of stupefaction and even madness.[112] As ballast, Henry turns to the condition for the reception of divine speech, which, simply put, is love for God.[113] Hence, in contrast to Henry of Friemar, this later Henry was so anxious to de-emphasize an unhealthy overreliance on supernatural explanations that he says practically nothing about

discerning angelic or demonic influence. The treatise concludes with a deliberate temporal hierarchy that determined whose spiritual impulses were, by definition, more meritorious.

> Therefore when it is doubted as to whether the visions or the miracles of someone are from a good spirit, it ought to be considered which state or position in the ecclesiastic hierarchy he occupies or occupied: certainly if he is a prelate or is a ruler [*praeses*], if he is a teacher [*doctor*] in the authority of the church, if he is legitimately sent by the church or singularly by God for doing those things, over which he involved himself. And he is bound to teach about his mission either through authentic letters, or evident miracles, or with frequent correct predictions of the future. Otherwise the spirit, by which such a one acts, should be held suspect.[114]

Such a ranking would not easily accommodate women, if at all.

Peter d'Ailly's *On False Prophets* takes a very different direction from the ones pursued by his two predecessors on discernment. Each of the Henrys was primarily concerned with the way in which various inspirations affect an individual's spiritual disposition, and how these can be recognized to ensure the person's welfare. Doubtless influenced by the external crises of the Hundred Years War and the papal schism, Peter d'Ailly assumes a more public-minded stance, focusing on Christian society at large and attempting to defend it from the threat presented by spiritual impostors. Yet despite his profound sensitivity to the dangers of his age, when Antichrist was nigh and his harbingers arose from multiple sites, the results of Peter's inquiry were sobering, proffering not even a modicum of certainty.[115] As such, they can be placed on a continuum with his efforts to exculpate the well-intentioned individual who wins merit through error. The difficulty of correct discernment resided in the fact that the mere possession of the gift of prophecy in no way proved that a particular person was sent by God, even if he or she were to prophesy successfully or cast out demons in Christ's name.[116] Evil individuals and pseudoprophets could and did work miracles: indeed, during what Peter took to be his own critical age with the end of the world impending, miracles had gone over to the wrong side and miracle workers were more apt to be evil than good.[117] The problem was exacerbated by the fact that the threat to the faith issued not from external foes but from indigenous seducers.[118] Furthermore, the members of this prophetic fifth column could even be sincere. For the individuals in question often did not know themselves for the seducers and hypocrites that they were, instead regarding themselves as saints who had truly conquered sin.[119]

Peter was attuned to Satan's preeminent role in the creation of these latter-day Simon Maguses. He warned that the power to work miracles did not require purity of life, since miracles were often performed by demons. Evil spirits could also correctly predict the future and provide

other compelling truths, using demoniacs or false prophets as nuncios.[120] Of course it was folly for anyone to rely on such assistance. Demons, ever working to effect humanity's perdition, often mixed the truth with falsehood. They also penetrated seemingly prophetic dreams, frequently leading the dreamer to despair and even suicide in some instances. Indeed, since all predictions of the future were either actually or potentially predicated on demonic assistance, Peter necessarily censured them all.[121]

Not surprisingly, Peter regarded the chances for an accurate exercise of spiritual discernment as extremely slender. He was nevertheless prepared to grant that certain telltale signs might assist in the process. For instance, the simulation of sanctity practiced by pseudoprophets frequently disappeared when they ceased to be praised or if they achieved limited worldly objectives. They tended to display impatience in adversity; lacked compassion for sinners; became irate over temporal reversals; and introduced singularities and novelties out of vainglory.[122] Finally, a true prophecy constituted an immobile truth and must therefore be fulfilled. If a prophecy proved false or failed to materialize, the prophet and prophecy alike were false.[123] Physiological evidence garnered from William of Auvergne was further adduced to provide a distinct profile for the prophetic disposition. Certain complexions were understood to be especially receptive to prophecy, as, for example, the melancholic complexion. Moreover, even though the gift of prophecy was not antithetical to vice in the same way that the perfection of grace was, the passions of the soul could still suspend prophetic gifts. But ultimately, Peter tends to rank the importance of the individual's moral disposition over his natural disposition.[124]

First and last, Peter is compelled to admit that there is no sufficient art of discernment handed down by Scripture for the purposes of distinguishing false prophets. The very existence of such an art would mean that the Christian faith or the law of Christ was susceptible to proof, which it clearly was not. At best, one could distinguish the difference between true and false prophecies only on the basis of probabilities, a practice that must always remain conjectural.[125] In short, acknowledging the impossibility of seeing the inner man, Peter determines that the most secure way of identifying false prophets is in accordance with Christ's admonition from the Sermon on the Mount: "By their fruits you shall know them (Matt. 7.16)."[126] By falling back upon such a rudimentary standard, Peter does little more than advocate a kind of grassroots, commonsense approach.

Paul had described spiritual discernment as a gift of the spirit (1 Cor. 12.10)—a gift that female mystics seem to have possessed in abundance. And yet the development of an academic theory of

discernment (even one characterized by Peter d'Ailly's brand of defeatism) necessarily sidelined the apostolic emphasis on practice, deflecting attention away from its female practitioners. This tendency was further compounded by the hierarchy of credibility for visionaries posited by Henry of Langenstein, which potentially discounted women altogether. What is additionally striking about this cadre of writers is the cavalier dismissal of the evidentiary standards that had been carefully developed over time in the persona of the living saint. Apart from the apprehensive, even disparaging, remarks about the dangers of spiritual consolations, there is no mention of raptures, stigmata, illness, or any of the many familiar indicators of medieval somatism so peculiarly characteristic of female saints.[127] The fact that such evidence would still play so crucial a role in Ercole d'Este's future defense of Lucia of Narni indicates that these dramatic proofs were not forgotten, nor had they ceased to impress. But they were sadly insufficient, except to the most naive of advocates. Science slowly, but relentlessly, began to triumph over miracle, just as theory trumped practice. The female mystic's gift of discernment was disregarded, while her newly pathologized body was rendered increasingly a target of mistrust as opposed to a receptacle of grace.

1 *Centilogium de impulsibus* 17.61–62, in *Oeuvres*, 8:142.

2 For an introduction to the disputation, see Palémon Glorieux, "L'enseignement au Moyen Age," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 43 (1968): 123–35. On its early days at the University of Paris, see John Baldwin, *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and His Circle* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1970), 1:96–107. On university training, see Ruth Karras, *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), pp. 67–108; M. Miche`le Mulchahey, *"First the Bow Is Bent in Study . . .": Dominican Education before 1350* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1998).

3 See chap. 4, p. 134, above.

4 Baldwin, *Masters*, 1:97.

5 Cf. Jody Enders's discussion of the contrast between the oral and the written quodlibet, in "The Theater of Scholastic Erudition," *Comparative Drama* 27 (1993): 341–63, esp. 345–46.

6 Baldwin, *Masters*, 1:98.

7 William Courtenay, "The Reception of Ockham's Thought at the University of Paris," in *Preuve et raisons a` l'Universite é de Paris: Logique, ontologie, et th è ologie au XIVe sie`cle*, ed. è non Kaluza and Paul Vignaux (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1984), pp. 48–50. Regarding John of Mirecourt's condemnation, see n. 46, below. Ze

8 Nicolas Eymeric, *Directorium inquisitorium . . . denuo ex collatione plurium exemplorum emendatum, et accessione multarum literarum Apostolicarum* pt. 3 (Rome: In aedibus Pop. Rom., 1578), col. 314; Isabella of Bourges, Doat, vol. 28, fol. 116v.

9 See chap. 4, p. 174, above.

10 See Stephen of Bourbon, *Anecdotes historiques, l è gendes et apologues tir è s du recueil in è dit d'Etienne de Bourbon*, ed. A. Lecoy de la Marche (Paris:

Librairie Renouard, 1877), no. 352, pp. 311 ff. Bernard Gui, *Practica inquisitionis hereticae* bk. 5, prologue, ed. Célestin Douais (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1886), p. 236; trans. *WE*, p. 377. See Gui's chapters "Concerning the Artifices and Deceptions in Which They Take Refuge When Examined," which simulates the interrogation of a wily Waldensian, and "Concerning the Sophistries and Ambiguities of Their Statements" (5.2.7–8, p. 253; trans. *WE*, pp. 397–402). Cf. David of Augsburg, who uses Gui almost verbatim, *Tractatus de haeresi pauperum de Lugduno*, in *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, ed. E. Marte`ne and U. Durand (Paris: Lutetia, 1717; reprint, New York: Burt Franklin, 1968), vol. 5, cols. 1789–91.

11 Gui, *Practica* 4.3.2, p. 218; Eymeric, *Directorium* pt. 3, p. 313. See Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis* (Paris: L. Favre, 1886), ad *quaestio*, 6:590; ad *probare*, 6:513.

12 See J.M.M.H. Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998); William Courtenay, "Inquiry and Inquisition: Academic Freedom in Medieval Universities," *Church History* 58 (1989): 168–81.

13 As cited by Palémon Glorieux, *La Litt è rature quodlib è tique de 1260 a` 1320* (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1935), 2:49. For the structure of these public debates, see 1:11–51. For the redaction and development of these questions as a literary genre, see 1:51–58; 2:9–49. Also see J. F. Wippel, "Quodlibetal Questions, Chiefly in Theological Faculties," in *Les Questions dispute è es et les questions quodlib è tiques dans les facult è s de th è ologie, de droit et de m è dicine*, ed. B. C. Bazan et al., Typologie des sources du Moyen Age Occidental, 44–45 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1985), pp. 153–222. Also see Leonard Boyle, "The Quodlibets of St. Thomas and Pastoral Care," in *Pastoral Care, Clerical Education and Canon Law, 1200–1400* (London: Variorum, 1981), II, pp. 233–34. Albert also allegedly told Thomas of Cantimpréthat once the devil appeared in the shape of another brother to interrupt his studies, disappearing when the sign of the cross was made (*De apibus* 2.57.34, p. 563).

14 Aquinas, *ST* 1a, q. 114, art. 2, 15:74–79.

15 Ibid.

16 Glorieux, *Litt è rature quodlib è tique*, 1:39–40.

17 Peter the Chanter was especially concerned. See Baldwin, *Masters*, 1:99, 101.

18 William of Ockham, quodlib. 5, q. 5, resp. ad obj. 1, in *Quodlibeta septem*, ed. Joseph Wey, in *Guillelmi de Ockham: Opera philosophica et theologica* (Saint Bonaventure, N.Y.: Saint Bona-venture University, 1980), 9:496; trans. Alfred Freddoso and Francis Kelley, *Quodlibetal Questions* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 1:416.

19 Joseph Owens, "Faith, Ideas, Illumination, and Experience," in *Cambridge History of Late Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Norman Kretzmann et. al (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 457; John Boler, "Intuitive and Abstractive Cognition," in ibid., pp. 469–70.

20 Tullio Gregory, "La tromperie divine," in Kaluza and Vignaux, *Preuve et raisons*, p. 190; Jean-Fran ç ois Genest, "Pierre de Ceffons et l'hypothe`se du Dieu Trompeur," in Kaluza and Vignaux, *Preuve et raisons*, pp. 200–203. In the early modern period, see Gregory, "Dio ingannatore e genio maligno: nota in margine alle *Meditationes* di Descartes," *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana* 53 (1974): 477–516.

21 Gregory, "La tromperie," pp. 191–92.

22 Robert Holkot, *In quatuor libros sententiarum quaestiones* bk. 3, q. 1, art. 8 (London, 1518; reprint, Frankfurt: Minerva, 1967), ZZZ. Similarly in his

discussion of contingency, Robert will deny that God can lie or present improper contentions (see Calvin Normore, "Future Contingents," in Kretzmann, *Cambridge History*, p. 374). Holkot has traditionally been described as a follower of Ockham, a view that William Courtenay challenges in "Was There an Ockhamist School?" in *Philosophies and Learning: Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. Maarten Hoenen et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1995), p. 270.

23 Holkot, *In quatuor libros* bk. 3, q. 1, art. 8, ad 2,2, BBB.

24 Ibid. art. 8, ad 2, 3, BBB.

25 Ibid. art. 6, ad 2, 3–4, BBB. Note that it was generally held that the devil could penetrate the senses and the imagination, but not the mind.

26 Ibid. art. 8, 3, 1, BBB.

27 Ibid. art. 8, ad 3, 2–3, BBB.

28 See Dyan Elliott, *Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), pp. 128–35.

29 John Rodington, as cited by Bruno Nardi, *Soggetto et oggetto del conoscere nella filosofia antica e medievale* (Rome: Ateneo, 1952), p. 80; Gregory, "La tromperie," p. 188. Cf. Walter Catton (ca. 1322), "The Second Question of the Prologue to Walter Catton's Commentary on the Sentences," in *Nine Medieval Thinkers: A Collection of Hitherto Unedited Texts*, ed. J. Reginald O'Donnell (Toronto: Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies, 1955), p. 246; Gregory, "La tromperie," pp. 188–90.

30 Holkot, *In quatuor libros* bk. 3, q. 1, art. 5–6, MM–ZZ.

31 Aquinas, quodlib. 3, q. 12 [art. 27], *sed contra*, in *Opera omnia: Quaestiones de quolibet*, ed. Ordo Fratrum Praedicatorum (Rome: Commissio Leonina, 1996), 25,1:286; cf. 3, q. 12 [art. 26], 25,1:283–85. This problem surfaces in the quodlibetal questions of others. See Godefroid of Fontaines, quodlib. 12, q. 2, *Les Quodlibets onze–quatorze de Godefroid de Fontaines*, ed. J. Hoffmans (Louvain: Editions de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, 1932), vol. 5, fasc. 2, pp. 83–92. Glorieux notes that Nicolas Bar and Peter of Auvergne both have quodlibets on this subject (*Litt è rature quodlib è tique*, 1:233, 257).

32 Aquinas, quodlib. 6, q. 4, art. 1 (6), *sed contra* and *resp.*, in *Opera omnia* 25,2:301–2.

33 See Dyan Elliott, "True Presence/False Christ: Antinomies of Embodiment in Medieval Spirituality," *Mediaeval Studies* 64 (2002): 241–65 (cf. the discussion of the trickery of God, pp. 258–68). Also see CarolineWalker Bynum's reflections on some of the physiological and psychological factors informing this kind of experience, in "The Woman in the Pearl Necklace," *Common Knowledge* 8 (2002): 280–83.

34 Holkot, *In quatuor libros* bk. 3, q. 1, art. 5, ad 1, 2, MM. See Genest, "Pierre de Ceffons," p. 202.

35 Holkot, *In quatuor libros* bk. 3, q. 1, art. 5, ad 1, 2–4, MM. Robert also does away with the possibility of attaching a condition such as "I worship you if you are God" since it not only weakens the adoration but implicates him in idolatry the moment he raises it as a possibility (ad 2, NN).

36 Ibid. art. 5, ad 3, NN.

37 Ibid. art 5, ad 3, 1, NN.

38 Ibid. art.5, ad 3, 2–4, NN. In this context, it was particularly alarming that mystics such as Ermine of Reims sometimes experienced demonic harassment in the form of a "good" interior voice (John Le Graveur, *Entre Dieu et Satan: les visions d'Ermine de Reims (] 1396)*, ed. Claude Arnaud-Gillet [Florence: Sismel, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 1997], p. 75). Also see n. 84, below.

39 Holkot, *In quatuor libros* bk. 3, q. 1, art. 5, ad 4, RR–TT.

40 Ibid. art. 5, UU.

41 This belief, common to the Beguins of southern France, originated with Olivi. See Gui, *Practica* 5.4.5, p. 273. Dorothea of Montau's confessor became extremely nervous when she made this slip, as did the visionary Christ (John of Marienwerder, *Vita Dorotheae Montoviensis Magistri Johannis Marienwerder* 1.6, ed. Hans Westpfahl, Forschungen und Quellen zur Kirchenund Kulturgeschichte Ostdeutschlands, vol. 1 [Cologne and Graz: Boïhlau, 1964], pp. 46–47).

42 Holkot, *In quatuor libros* bk. 3, q. 1, art. 6, ad 5, UU.

43 Ibid. art. 6, resolutio, VV.

44 Oxford, Bodleian MS, 361, c. 8, fol. 487. It may be a stretch to call this work a medical treatise since it announces itself as a work on female dress (*De ornamentis mulierum*, fol. 480). The pagination, however, is disturbed and the treatise interrupted by descriptions of various forms of madness. The manuscript dates from the mid–fifteenth century.

45 Denifle, nos. 1023, 1042; 2:485–86, 505–7. See Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy*, pp. 57–72; and William Courtenay, "The Registers of the University of Paris and the Statutes against Scientia Occiamica," *Vivarium* 1 (1991): 13–49, who raises the possibility of a lost statute. Academic heretics were generally disciplined by a commission of theological masters of the university. In the fourteenth century, however, papal commissioners are introduced, tending to increase the number of condemnations. See idem, "Inquiry and Inquisition," pp. 174–77.

46 Denifle, no. 1147, 2:610–14. A preliminary list of some sixty-three errors was narrowed down to forty-one (see Denifle's discussion on 2:613, which explains discrepancies in the numbering). This shorter list was included in the *Collectio errorum*, which was drawn up for the University of Paris. John wrote two defenses on his own behalf. See Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy*, pp. 82–83; also Genest, "Pierre de Ceffons," pp. 197–99. Courtenay, however, sees John of Mire-court's work as much more mainstream than is traditionally thought, arguing that John was primarily being condemned for his *subtilitas* and *aporia* as opposed to any particular doctrine ("John of Mirecourt and Gregory of Rimini on 'Whether God Can Undo the Past,' " *Recherches de th è ologie ancienne et m è di è vale* 39 [1972]: 173); cf. idem, "Erfurt CA 127 and the Censured Articles of Mirecourt and Autrecourt," in *Die Bibliotheca Amploniana: Ihre Bedeutung im Spannungsfeld von Aristotelismus, Nominalismus und Humanismus*, ed. Andreas Speer (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), pp. 341–45.

47 Denifle, no. 1218, 3:21–23; esp. art. 6, p. 22. See Genest, "Pierre de Ceffons," pp. 206–7.

48 Peter d'Ailly, *Quaestiones magistri Petri de Alliaco Cardinalis cameracensis super primum tertium et quartum sententiarum* bk. 1, q. 12, art. 3, dubitatio 3 (Paris: Jehan Petit, 1505?), fol. 190r.

49 Peter d'Ailly, *Quaestio: Utrum conscientia erronea excusat a culpa*, in *Joannis Gersonii opera omnia*, ed. L. Ellies du Pin (Antwerp: Sumptibus societatis, 1706), 1:640–41; cf. Holkot, *In quatuor libros* bk. 1, q. 1, art. 5, NN. Though prepared to grant that an erroneous conscience might win merit, Peter explicitly disagrees with Robert Holkot's view that an intellectual act is involuntary and thus morally neutral. Peter perceives heresy as voluntary, sinful, and impossible to exculpate (*Quaestio: Utrum conscientia erronea*, in *Joannis Gersonii opera*, 1:639).

50 Peter is certainly familiar with Robert Holkot, summarizing his chief points (*Quaestiones . . . super primum tertium et quartum sententiarum* bk. 1, q. 12, art. 3, dubitatio 3, fol. 187r). But the article primarily refutes the opposing view of Gregory of Rimini (d. 1358) (fols. 187r–89v). Gregory resists the implications of God's absolute power, maintaining that the deity cannot do

anything depraved, such as lie. He is impatient with the explanations "of certain modern doctors"—clearly referring to Robert Holkot et al.—who make subtle distinctions between degrees of deception (*Gregorii Ariminensis OESA Lectura super primum et secundum Sententiarum* bk. 1, dist. 42–44, q. 2, art. 1, conclusio 1, ed. A. Damasus Trapp [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984], 3:392–94).

51 D'Ailly, *Quaestiones . . . super primum tertium et quartum sententiarum* bk. 1, q. 12, art. 3, fol. 183v.

52 See Zénon Kaluza, "Gerson et les querelles doctrinales," in *Les Querelles doctrinales a` Paris: Nominalistes et R è alistes aux confins du XIVe et du XVe sie`cles* (Bergamo: Pierluigi Lubrina, 1988), p. 44. Kaluza notes that a sophistical demon occurs in Gerson's *Collectorium super Magnificat*, rendering him something of a stock figure. Also see Kaluza, "Les écoles doctrinales," ibid., pp. 13–14, and Courtenay, "Was There an Ockhamist School?" pp. 263–64 and n. 4. Also see James Connolly, *Jean Gerson: Reformer and Mystic* (Louvain: Librairie Universitaire, 1928), pp. 71–89.

53 See Gerson, *Oeuvres*, 2:26–28; trans. Brian McGuire, *Jean Gerson: Early Works* (New York: Paulist Press, 1998), pp. 172–75. Gerson had only just resumed the chancellorship, having temporarily resigned, disgusted by the university's corruption and fatigued by the odious responsibilities associated with the post. See his letter of 1400, probably also addressed to Peter d'Ailly, in *Oeuvres*, 2:17–23; trans. McGuire, pp. 160–68. On this episode in Gerson's life, see Palémon Glorieux, "La vie et les oeuvres de Gerson: essai chronologique," in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et litte è raire du Moyen Age* 25–26 (1950–51): 159–60; Connolly, *John Gerson*, pp. 79–90.

54 Gerson, *Contra curiositatem studentium*, in *Oeuvres*, 3:230, 238. A large portion of the first part of this treatise has been translated by Steven Ozment in *Jean Gerson: Selections from "A Deo exivit," "Contra curiositatem studentium," and "De mystica theologia speculativa"* (Leiden: Brill, 1969).

55 Gerson, *Contra curiositatem studentium*, in *Oeuvres*, 3:231.

56 Ibid., p. 238.

57 Ibid., p. 240.

58 Bonaventure is upheld as a model for scrutinizing and unifying various opinions into an orthodox whole (ibid., p. 241; also see his evocation of Bonaventure on pp. 231, 237). Gerson follows this up with a critique-cum-parody of what he presents as the different theological schools (pp. 241–46). The kind of singularity they seek makes the faculty of theology comparable to the tower of Babel, also riven by various languages (p. 248). According to Kaluza's assessment, however, Gerson's characterizations tell us precious little about the actual doctrinal quarrels of his day ("Gerson et les querelles doctrinales," pp. 62–63).

59 Gerson, *De examinatione doctrinarum*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:474–75.

60 Ibid., p. 475.

61 Gerson, *De signis bonis et malis*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:164.

62 Sulpicius Severus, *Vie de Saint Martin* c. 24, ed. Jacques Fontaine, *SC*, no. 133 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1967), 1:307–9; trans. Alexander Roberts, *The Life of Saint Martin*, *LNPNF*, vol. 11 (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Eerdman's, 1964), p. 16.

63 *De apibus* 2.57.39, pp. 566–67. Cf. the similar experience of Ermine of Reims, in which, however, the episode is stripped of all comedic potential (Le Graveur, *Entre Dieu et Satan*, p. 68).

64 *De apibus* 2.29.15, pp. 300–303; cf. James of Vitry's exemplum no. 303 (*The Exempla or Illustrative Stories from the Sermones Vulgares of Jacques de Vitry*, ed. Thomas Frederick Crane, Folk-Lore Society Publications, 26 [London: Folk-

Lore Society, 1878; reprint, Nendeln: Liechten-stein, 1878], p. 127). On father-daughter incest in the Middle Ages, see Elizabeth Archibald, *Incest and the Medieval Imagination* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), pp. 145–91.

65 Fortunately, the Virgin Mary had predicted this diabolical visit ahead of time and warned the boy (*De apibus* 2.55.2, pp. 532–34).

66 Ibid. 2.57.61, pp. 585–87. Cf. the demonic role assigned to the Benedictine nun by Caesarius of Heisterbach, discussed in Elliott, *Fallen Bodies*, pp. 31–33.

67 *De apibus* 2.57.23, pp. 553–55. The brother had brought a consecrated host with him, which made the whole scenario vanish.

68 Ibid. 2.30.42, p. 346; also see the story of the entire fake cr[egrave]che scene exposed by Conrad. For women taken in by holy-seeming incubi, see Elliott, *Fallen Bodies*, p. 54.

69 William of Auvergne, *De universo* pt. 2, 3, c. 24, in *Opera omnia* (Paris: A. Pralard, 1674; reprint, Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1963), 1:1066, 68. Cf. Dyan Elliott, "The Physiology of Rapture and Female Spirituality," in *Medieval Theology and the Natural Body*, ed. Peter Biller and Alastair Minnis (Woodbridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell and Brewer, 1997), p. 157.

70 See chap. 5, n. 50, above.

71 *De apibus* 2.57.47, p. 575.

72 Ibid. 2.57.43, p. 569. But later, Jordan will have a slightly more successful encounter with the devil (2.57.46, pp. 570–74). There are even instances of demoniacs themselves exercising discernment. Cf. the episode of the demoniac cleric burning a heretic in chap. 2, p. 68, above.

73 *De apibus* 2.42.2, pp. 413–14.

74 Albert the Great, *Quaestio de raptu* art. 2.3, *Quaestiones*, in *Opera omnia*, ed. Bernhard Geyer (Aschendorff: Monasterium Westfalorum, 1993), 25,2:93. Albert ultimately argued that grace is intrinsic to rapture. There was also the related widespread belief that the devil could physically raise individuals into a rapture that was more like an abduction than a spiritual experience. See Elliott, "Physiology of Rapture," pp. 150–51.

75 William of Auvergne, *De universo* pt. 2, 2, c. 152, in *Opera* 1:1003.

76 William of Auvergne, *De universo* pt. 2, 3, c. 18, in *Opera*, 1:1050. The person would also be left with the same horrible expression that William associates with demonic possession. Cf. Peter d'Ailly, *De falsis prophetis*, in *Joannis Gersonii opera*, tract 2, 1:535–36, 539. Peter seems to follow William of Auvergne quite closely in this discussion. See Richard Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 158–59. The inquisitors of heresy also prosecuted magicians. See ibid., pp. 190–92.

77 William of Auvergne, *De universo* pt. 2, 3, c. 13, in *Opera*, 1:1041.

78 William of Auvergne, *De universo* pt. 3, 2, c. 36, in *Opera*, 1:881. Angelic possession is considerably more gentle since angels are the friends of humanity. Cf. pt. 2, 3, c. 13, p. 1042. Note the change in Magdalena Beutler's voice (chap. 5, p. 198, above).

79 William of Auvergne, *De universo* pt. 2, 3, c. 152, in *Opera*, 1:1002; cf. *De apibus* 2.57.19, pp. 550–51.

80 John Nider, *Formicarium* 3.1 (Douai: B. Belleri, 1602), pp. 183–84.

81 *SVMO*, p. 576, trans. King, pp. 15–16; *VMO*, pp. 553, 558, trans. King, pp. 29, 48–49. On a similar note, she could also discern whether or not a priest communicated unworthily (*VMO*, p. 563; trans. King, p. 70).

82 See *VMO*, p. 563, trans. King, pp. 68–69; cf. *Die Wundergeschicten des Caesarius von Heisterbach*, ed. Alfons Hilka (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1933), no.

161, 1:128. Also see Ernest McDonnell, *The Beguines and Beghards in Medieval Culture* (New York: Octagon, 1969), p. 329.

[83] The period in question covers the first part of her vita, which chronicles her visions from 31 October 1395 to 18 January 1396. See Le Graveur, *Entre Dieu et Satan*, for visions of her confessor (pp. 55, 62, 65); her husband (pp. 56, 62); compatriots (pp. 57, 63, 69); Saints Leger (p. 58), Andrew (p. 59), John the Baptist (p. 60), Mary Magdalene (p. 66), Peter (p. 70); the departed friend (p. 61); angels (pp. 64–65). Other saints were also tested by demonic doubles of their confessors. See, for example, a case in the life of Frances of Rome, discussed in Dyan Elliott, "*Dominae or Dominatae*? Female Mysticism and the Trauma of Textuality," in *Women, Marriage, and Family in Medieval Christendom*, ed. Constance Rousseau and Joel Rosenthal (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, 1998), pp. 47–48.

[84] Le Graveur, *Entre Dieu et Satan*, pp. 64, 65. However, as a result of her multiple ordeals, and, as her confessor tells us, out of modesty, she was never exactly certain when she was the recipient of a visitation from good spirits. This comment comes at the end of a vision of a woman claiming to be Mary Magdalene, and whose identity is not satisfactorily resolved. Intially, Ermine assumes that Magdalene and her angelic host are frauds; then, after several hours of conversing, she begins to waver (ibid., p. 80). Note that Ermine refers to her supernatural guest as the white lady (*blanche dame*); cf. n. 88, below.

[85] See *Legenda trium sociorum* c. 5, in *Fontes Franciscani*, ed. Enrico Menesto` and Stefano Brufani (Assisi: Edizioni Porziuncola, 1995), pp. 1385–86; ed. and trans. in *St. Francis of Assisi: Writings and Early Biographies*, ed. Marion Habig (Chicago: Franciscan Herald, 1973), pp. 903–4. On the phenomenon of the talking image, see AndréVauchez, "L'Image vivante: Quelques réflexions sur les fonctions des représentations iconographiques dans le domaine religieux en Occident aux derniers sie`cles du Moyen Age," in *Biedni i Bogaci: Studia z dziejo è w spo3eczen è stwa i kultury ofiarowane Bronis3awowi Geremkowi w szes è c è dziesia^{2}ta^2 rocznice^2 urodzin* (Warsaw: Wy-dawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1992), esp. pp. 235–36.

[86] Enrico Menesto`, ed., *Il processo di canonizzazione di Chiara da Montefalco* (Regione dell'Umbria: La Nuova Italia, 1984), Sr. Johanna, art. 86, pp. 42–43; Br. Franchischus, art. 86, p. 280. According to both Franchischus and Johanna, Clare associated this episode with the rise of the Free Spirit movement in Italy, against which Clare was active. For Clare's efforts against the Free Spirit movement, including her collaboration with the inquisitors, see Sr. Johanna, art. 88, pp. 45–46, art. 112, p. 57, art. 114, pp. 57–59; Sr. Thomassa, art. 112, pp. 224–25, art. 114, p. 226, art. 115, pp. 226–27; Br. Franchischus, art. 112, pp. 287–91.

[87] Prior Peter Olafson and Master Peter Olafson, *Vita b. Brigide* c. 71, ed. Isak Collijn, *Acta et processus canonizacionis Beate Birgitte* (Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells, 1924–31), p. 96; trans. Albert Kezel, *Birgitta of Sweden: Life and Selected Revelations* (New York: Paulist Press, 1990), p. 94.

[88] See Pierre Tisset, ed., *Proc[egrave]s de condamnation de Jeanne d'Arc* (Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1960), 1:104–5, 116, 256. Catherine claimed to receive nocturnal visits from a beautiful lady in white (*domina alba*). When Joan stayed awake in order to verify this, the supernatural visitor did not materialize.

[89] Ibid., pp. 81–82; also see Tisset's historical commentary, 3:114–17.

[90] See Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987), p. 228.

[91] See Bernard of Clairvaux's Serm. 23 (*De discretione spirituum* or *De septem*

spiritibus), in *PL* 183, cols. 600–603; idem, Serm. 32, *PL* 183, cols. 945–51. Richard of Saint Victor, *Benjamin minor* c. 66, *PL* 196, cols. 47–51. Bernard's approach is not very systematic and the term "discernment" is loosely applied. For instance, one of its functions is to distinguish which of the Holy Spirit's gifts are for ourselves, and which are for others (Serm. 88, *PL* 183, cols. 706–7). For Richard, discernment is more a virtue that enables self-knowledge than a way of distinguishing the inspiration behind visions.

92 James of Vitry, selections from his *Sermones vulgares*, in *Analecta Novissima Spicilegii Solesmensis altera continuatio*, ed. J. B. Pitra, vol. 2, *Tusculana* (Paris: Roger and Chernowitz, 1888), serm. 29, pp. 384–85.

93 John of Marienwerder, *Septilimium B. Dorotheae* 5.1, ed. Franz Hipler, *AB* 4 (1885): 216.

94 Bridget repeatedly ran away from the visionary Christ, thereby testing the truth of the revelation (see the life by Prior Peter Olafson from Alvastra and by Master Peter Olafson from Skän-ninge, which was included in Bridget's process of canonisation, Collijn, *Acta et processus canonizacionis beate Birgitte*, pp. 80–81; trans. Kezel, *Birgitta of Sweden*, pp. 77–78). Book 5 of her *Revelationes* also focuses on the figure of an interrogating friar, whom she recognizes as a kindof demonic tempter. See the epigraph to chap. 7, below. On instruction in spiritual discernment in Bridget's writings, see Rosalynn Voaden, *God's Words, Women's Voices: The Discernment of Spirits in the Writing of Late-Medieval Women Visionaries* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 1999), pp. 100–104. On the discernment to which Bridget's revelations were subjected, both by herself and by her clerical entourage, see Claire Sahlin, *Birgitta of Sweden and the Voice of Prophecy* (Wood-bridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 2001), pp. 117–20. Catherine of Siena addresses an aspect of discernment. But, paralleling authorities like Cassian, she understands discernment not primarily in terms of distinguishing Satanic impulses but in the sense of the regulatory virtue of discretion. See particularly her *Libro della divina dottrina volgarmente detto Dialogo della Divina Provvidenza* c. 9–11, ed. Mathilde Fiorilli, 2d. ed. (Bari: G. Laterza and Sons, 1928), pp. 21–28; trans. Suzanne Noffke, *Catherine of Siena: The Dialogue* (New York: Paulist Press, 1980), pp. 39–45.

95 Also note later treatises by Bernardino of Siena (d. 1444), *De inspirationum discretione*, in *Opera omnia*, ed. Fathers of the College of Saint Bonaventure (Florence: College of Saint Bona-venture, 1959), 6:243–90; and Denis the Carthusian, *De discretione et examinatione spirituum*, in *D. Dionysi Cartusiani opera omnia in unum corpus digesta*, vol. 4, *Opera minora* (Tournai: Typis Carthusiae S. M. de Pratis, 1911), 8:267–319. Bernardino's treatise is rather derivative of general teaching on this subject. Denis's work is especially indebted to Gerson's writings. In addition to specific treatises, monastic chroniclers never ceased to relay the patristic tales that concerned spiritual discernment. See, for example, Jordan of Saxony's history of the Augustinian Hermits in *Liber Vitasfratrum* 4.11, ed. Rudolph Arbesmann and Winfrid Hümpfner (New York: Cosmopolitan Science, 1943), pp. 426–30.

96 See Wendy Love's discussion of Langenstein and d'Ailly in "Free Spirits, Presumptuous Women, and False Prophets: The Discernment of Spirits in the Late Middle Ages" (Ph.D. diss., Divinity School, University of Chicago, 2002), pp. 208–33. (The dissertation was only recently made known to me by Brian McGuire, to whom I am grateful.) For the argument that Gerson's interest preceded that of his mentor, Peter d'Ailly, see chap. 7, n. 6, below.

97 Henry of Friemar is named regent in the various documents he witnessed between 1307 and 1309, among which are the trials of the Templars and the trial of Marguerite Porete (see Glorieux, *Litt è rature quodlib è tique*, 2:130).

[98] Henry of Friemar, *Tractatus de quatuor instinctibus*, in *Insignis atque preclarus de deliciis sensibilibus paradisi liber: cum singulari tractatu de quatuor instinctibus* (Venice: Iacobus Pentius, 1498), 57v–68r. See Clemens Stroick, *Heinrich von Friemar* (Freiburg: Herder, 1954), pp. 1–27 for his life; for the manuscript tradition of this work, see pp. 36–37. Also see Konrad Gesner, *Bibliotheca instituta et collecta, primum a Conrado Gesnero*, ed. Johannes Jacobus Frisius (Zurich: C. Froschovervs, 1583), p. 334. Henry had a reputation for profound devotion and learning among his confreres. According to Jordan of Saxony, the chronicler of the order, Henry would often become rapt with devotion in the course of saying mass: his face would become red as a seraph's, tears would stream from his eyes, and onlookers would be profoundly moved. He was also alleged to be a zealous scholar who was still hard at work well into his seventies. When the other brothers jokingly asked if he had not learned enough at Paris, Henry allegedly responded, " 'If I had one foot in the grave, I would wish to learn up until then' " (Jordan of Saxony, *Liber Vitasfratrum* 2.18, 2.22; pp. 204–5, 238). Henry was also known for his impeccable preparation for saying mass. He would say the canonical hours, his own special prayers, and go to confession—even if he was aware of no particular sin.

[99] Henry of Friemar, *Tractatus de quatuor instinctibus*, fols. 59r–62r.

[100] Ibid., fol. 62v.

[101] Ibid., fol. 63r.

[102] Ibid., fol. 63v.

[103] Ibid., fol. 64r.

[104] Ibid., fol. 65r.

[105] Ibid., fol. 67r.

[106] Ibid., fol. 64v.

[107] Henry of Langenstein, *De discretione spirituum* c. 1–2, in *Heinrichs von Langenstein "Unterscheidung der Geister" Lateinisch und Deutsch*, ed. Thomas Hohman (Munich: Artemis Verlag, 1977), pp. 52–58. The treatise was written in 1383. Its probable influence on Gerson is discussed below. But it was widely used in Denis the Carthusian's treatise on spiritual discernment, written in 1433. For a brief account of Henry's life, see the entry by Fran ç ois Vandenbroucke, *DS*, 7,1, cols. 215–19.

[108] Henry of Langenstein, *De discretione spirituum* c. 12, pp. 108–10.

[109] Ibid. c. 4, p. 72; also see pp. 74, 76.

[110] Ibid. c. 2, p. 60; c. 3, p. 64.

[111] Ibid. c. 4, p. 74.

[112] Ibid. c. 3, p. 69; c. 4, p. 70.

[113] Ibid. c. 9, pp. 98 ff.

[114] Ibid. c. 13, p. 114.

[115] Peter d'Ailly, *De falsis prophetis*, tract 1, col. 503.

[116] Ibid., col. 501.

[117] Ibid., col. 503. Cf. Gregory the Great's gloomy anticipation of precisely this situation in the epigraph to the section "Orthodox Heretic, Heretical Martyr" in chap. 4, above.

[118] Ibid., tract 2 , col. 521.

[119] Ibid., col. 523.

[120] Ibid., tract 1, col. 505; tract. 2, col. 512; tract 2, col. 528; on how demons know the future, see tract 2, cols. 564 ff.

[121] Ibid., tract 2, cols. 579, 581. On the various ways of seeing the future and the demonic contribution, see cols. 541–54.

[122] Ibid., col. 523.

[123] Ibid., col. 528.

[124] Ibid., tract 1, fol. 502; tract 2, cols. 537–38.

[125] Ibid., tract 2, cols. 511, 577–78.

[126] Ibid., tract 1, cols. 497, 500; tract 2, cols. 511, 523.

[127] Denis the Carthusian is an exception in this context, recognizing certain raptures, inflammations, elevations, etc., as important signs of divine favor (*De discretione et examinatione spirituum*, arts. 2 and 5, in *Opera*, vol. 4, *Opera minora*, 8:268, 270–72). Cf. this flowery (but vague) description of mystical experience to his more explicit examples of somatic experiences in rapture in a treatise clearly written with a different end in mind. In the latter he cites Aquinas's and Francis's levitations, the latter's reception of the stigmata, the miraculous lights around the enraptured Francis and Clare of Assisi (d. 1253), Elisabeth of Spalbeek's rapture during communion, Catherine of Siena's physical immovability in rapture, and the miraculous lightning resulting from John Ruusbroec's contemplation (*De contemplatione tres libri* 30.19, in *Opera*, vol. 41, *Opera minora*, 8:281).

Chapter Seven

John Gerson and Joan of Arc

> [Birgitta] saw then, in spirit, a ladder which was
>
> fixed in the earth and whose top touched the sky. And at its top, in the sky, she saw the Lord Jesus Christ seated on a wonderful throne like a judge judging. . . .And in the middle of that same ladder, the aforesaid Lady Birgitta saw a certain religious, known to her and at that time still alive in the body—a man of great erudition in the science of theology but full of guile and diabolic malice. Because of his extremely impatient and restless gestures, this man looked
>
> more like a devil than a humble religious. And then the said lady saw the thoughts and all the internal affections of the heart of that religious and he manifested them with inordinate and restless gestures, by means of questions.[1]
>
> (Bridget of Sweden)

BRIDGET OF SWEDEN'S fifth book of revelations, *The Book of Questions*, from which the above passage is taken, is cast as a kind of disputation between a diabolical religious and Christ.[2] Clearly John Gerson was not alone in envisaging the scholar as a potential abettor of evil. But the chancellor and the mystic would probably have differed concerning who exactly had gone over to the devil. Gerson doubtless saw his own efforts to constrain mysticism as according him a place on the side of the angels. His famous challenge of Bridget's revelations and canonization alike, a platform from which he would launch a major campaign against female mysticism, would be additional proof of how richly deserving he was. But Bridget's supporters doubtless would have regarded Gerson's intervention differently, perhaps construing the vision of the diabolical theologian as striking proof of her prophetic perspicacity. Indeed, had the timing been a little different, Gerson himself might have fit the bill as the demonic cleric. And yet to a later generation of female mystics, the drama being enacted, the set, and even some of the roles were changing. As the lecture hall collapsed into the courtroom, so Christ the judge was supplanted by the diabolical theologian, while the mystic replaced the cleric. But the person standing before the theologian was no longer introduced as a potential disputant but arraigned as a defendant.

Gerson is the last in our series of Parisian masters who addressed spiritual discernment; his writings on the subject are not only the most prolix but also the most influential.[3] This corpus also helps to illuminate, even as it abets, the plummeting estimation of female spirituality in the scholarly world. Moreover, Gerson's intervention is

marked by his efforts to develop a procedural/juridical response to the challenge of contemporary mysticism. He thus unites various strains that particularly contributed to the holy woman's downward spiral: the inquisitorial method, scholasticism, the manipulation of medical discourse. But Gerson's efforts to wield the impressive mechanism that he developed were marked by failure. This becomes especially clear late in his career with his unsuccessful attempt to defend Joan of Arc. From a certain perspective, Gerson was under-mined by the very success of his campaign against female mysticism: Joan's pivotal intervention in the Hundred Years War epitomizes the potential of female mysticism for political mobilization and thus represents everything to which Gerson had opposed himself. Gerson's inability to apply adequately his system of discernment in defense of Joan provides striking demonstrations of both the negative, incriminating vector of his scholastic-inquisitorial approach to discernment and, on a larger scale, the impossibility for discourse to control or contain its own effects. Spiritual discernment as envisaged by Gerson and his cohort seems to promise an enhancement of clerical control. But both Gerson's treatment of Joan and the incalculable response it provokes point to the contrary effect: far from providing a mechanism for distinguishing counterfeit from genuine spirituality, spiritual discernment emerges as an inadvertent abettor of confusion in categories.

Gerson's various treatises sustain many of the concerns already treated by Henry of Langenstein, particularly the tendency to naturalize the supernatural; the suspicion of spiritual excesses; the apprehension of various alleged spiritual consolations; and a hierarchy of credibility, which, for Gerson, was extended from the visionary to the assessor.[4] Both men also contested the idea of a loquacious deity: genuine divine communications would not simply be serendipitous and diverting episodes, but would be impelled by a high degree of necessity. Henry of Langenstein expressed this conviction through the biblical citation "God spoke once, and was silent" (Job 33.14). Gerson would, in turn, adopt this succinct biblical formula, although (unlike God) he was not ashamed to repeat it.[5]

Although Gerson seems to have drawn directly only upon the work of Henry of Langenstein, his writings nevertheless unite and extend key aspects of the discourse as developed by all three of his predecessors. As with Henry of Friemar, Gerson's discussion of discernment will include an indictment of scholarly vanity. While Gerson emphasizes the assessment of individual spirituality in the manner of the two Henrys, he nevertheless shares in Peter d'Ailly's preoccupation with the larger impact on Christendom effected by the many individuals who claimed revelations from God.[6] We also see a

progression in the degree of engagement with contemporary issues. The works of both Henry of Friemar and Henry of Langenstein are theoretical and abstract. D'Ailly, in contrast, speaks in vague terms about the proximity of Antichrist and his minions, yet presents them as contemporary threats. Gerson's treatises are very much grounded in the moment, reveling in the specific and anecdotal. In addition, Gerson further develops and sharpens the physiological understanding of visions that was already apparent in the works of Henry of Langenstein and Peter d'Ailly, two of his professors at the university. As with his intervention in the nascent discourse on the dangers of scrupulosity, Gerson will associate many mystical phenomena with pathological disorders of various sorts, rendering the body even more suspect. But undoubtedly one of his most influential initiatives was the gendering of this discourse. Gerson was largely responsible for the "top-down" initia tive to control female spirituality frequently associated with the flourishing of treatises on spiritual discernment in the later Middle Ages.[7] Thus while Peter d'Ailly expressed concern over the nebulous category of false prophets, it was Gerson who identified these suspect individuals primarily as women. Indeed, poaching upon the clergy's predilection for medical imagery, we might venture that earlier writers could be perceived as surgeons inventing a new instrument. Gerson will not only sharpen the instrument but also diagnose which patients require the operation.[8]

Gerson was responding to the emergence of a cadre of prominent female mystics of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries who had begun to play an unprecedented role in public life.[9] The triune disasters of the Black Death, the Hundred Years War, and the papal schism created a vacuum in institutional authority into which female mystics and prophets had moved. Gerson's challenge of the recent canonization of Bridget of Sweden at the Council of Constance (1415), articulated in his treatise *On the Proving of Spirits*, was a direct response to the impact of the female visionaries of the period.[10] Still, his apprehension about female spirituality far antedated his challenge to Bridget, springing fully armed from his head in his very first treatise on discernment. *On Distinguishing True from False Revelations*, written in 1401, already associates women with a dangerous immoderacy in asceticism. In particular, he evokes a nameless woman in Arras who, having rejected proper pastoral counsel, was starving herself to death.[11] His is a tonally ugly rendition of the female spirituality associated with eucharistic feasting and ascetical fasting described in the work of Caroline Walker Bynum. Further, when arguing against the efficacy of miracles or revelations lacking in necessity, Gerson gives the example of a woman who frequently saw Christ flying through the air: "this sign of truth has shown, unless I am

mistaken, that she was out of her mind."[12] This early work on discernment depicts women as dangerously inclined to confuse carnal and spiritual love. To this end, he tells of a certain Marie of Valenciennes, better known to history as Marguerite Porete, who wrongfully exploited Augustine's dictum "Have charity, and do what you want."[13] *On the Proving of Spirits* will further identify women as particularly likely to be led astray by the degree of their fervor. Such women develop inappropriate relations with their confessors under the pretext of frequent confession. Finally, these women are possessed by an unsavory degree of curiosity, "which leads to gazing about and talking (not to mention touching)." It is no coincidence that this characterization corresponds to a medical understanding of women's greater humidity, which would lead to a desire for novelty.[14]

It is in his third treatise, *On the Examination of Doctrine* of 1423, however, that Gerson goes beyond merely discrediting female mystical experiences, working with particular zeal to disqualify women altogether as appropriate arbiters of spiritual matters. Opening with a discussion of the various ecclesiastical bodies equipped to act as judges in matters of faith, he eventually turns to the gift of spiritual discernment. Although acknowledging that Augustine's mother, Monica, was possessed of the gift of discernment (as Augustine himself had ventured in the), Gerson cautions against any woman who claims this gift for her self. 15 He further applies the apostolic interdict against female teaching to all forms of publication, oral or written.

> Jerome blames men who, for shame, learn from women what they teach men. What if someone of the female sex were reckoned to walk in the great and marvelous things above herself; to add daily vision upon vision; to report lesions of the brain through epilepsy or petrification, or some kind of melancholy as a miracle, (etc.); to say nothing unless in the place of God without any mediation; to call priests her sons; to teach them the profession in which they were assiduously brought up. . . .One woman says that she was annihilated for a little while: another says that she was united in a union with God, more marvelous than the union Christ assumed with his own humanity.[16]

Gerson trips lightly from Virgil's denunciation of woman's mutability, to apostolic warnings against young and curious women, to a denunciation of Eve who, according to his reckoning, lied twice in her first utterance. All female verbiage should be scrutinized much more carefully than male, since human and divine law unite in attempting to restrain women. The fact that no writing remains from the female greats of patristic lore, such as Paula or Eustochium, is but a

testimony to these women's discretion.[17]

From the perspective of earlier writings on spiritual discernment, it is worth repeating that Gerson was the first to diagnose a certain kind of spiritual duplicity or deception as a woman's problem, and that this diagnosis was in no way implicit in the discourse that he had inherited.[18] The treatises of his immediate predecessors remained quite abstract, resisting the association of spiritual frailty with any particular individual, group, or gender. This remains true even when there may have been a legitimate reason to mistrust female religious fervor. Henry of Friemar, for example, was a member of the theological tribunal responsible for condemning the work of the mystic and purported heresiarch of the Free Spirit movement Marguerite Porete (Gerson's Marie of Valenciennes). Yet Henry's treatise on spiritual discernment did not target women.[19] Moreover, both Henry of Langenstein and Peter d'Ailly were deeply invested in the prophecies of Hildegard of Bingen (d. 1179) and believed that she had correctly pre-dicted the papal schism.[20] Henry actually wrote a detailed letter to the bishop of Worms, bringing him up to date on what Hildegard ("that perspicuous scrutinizer and veracious preeminence [*summator*]") had to say on the subject.[21] More remarkably, Peter d'Ailly, despite his skeptical attitude toward prophecy, nevertheless punctuates his treatise with quotations from Hildegard—the only nonbiblical prophet whom he consistently (and approvingly) cites.[22] His active promotion of a woman in this context is but an extension of his egalitarian view that it was everyone's responsibility to profess the faith publicly in cases of emergency.[23]

Many of Peter's contemporaries would have agreed that the late fourteenth century satisfied even the most cautious criteria for what constituted a state of emergency. Gerson himself was almost morbidly preoccupied with the confusion of the times and quick to excoriate the responsible parties. He initially blamed the University of Paris for the prolongation of the schism, which he considered to be second in degree of culpability only to the papacy and the prelates.[24] (Meanwhile, painfully aware of the crisis in conscience provoked by the schism, he attempted to address the fears of a perplexed population with reassurances that, should a person align him-or herself with the wrong pope, God would credit the individual's good intentions.)[25] Gerson likewise averred that the devastation wrought by the Hundred Years War was exacerbated by the sinful irresponsibility of the ruling class.[26] But, however attuned he might be to the turbulent political climate or aggrieved at the failure of masculine leadership, Gerson resisted Peter's equation of such dire straits with a more generalized mandate for proclaiming the faith. On the contrary, Gerson's reaction was to circle the wagons of clerical prerogative.

Yet Peter was hardly alone in recognizing that when male mechanisms of power were at an impasse, women should be not only empowered but even obliged to step forward. Medieval society at large had various tacit and expressed ways of acknowledging this phenomenon. Hildegard of Bingen had justified her prophetic mission by articulating how God, no longer able to rely on corrupt men, had actually turned to frail women as vessels for the divine word.[27] The queen's role as mediator in the later Middle Ages was often a way out of the gridlock of high politics. 28 Women's mystical involvement in the papal schism and the Hundred Years War, clearly the most public of female visionary interventions to date, are but illustrations of how turmoil and structural instability opened the way to female speech.[29]

But far from resulting in peace, female interventions often protracted existing difficulties or generated new ones. For instance, in 1384 Constance of Rabastens, hailing from the dangerous region of Albi, that former bastion of the Cathar heresy, posited that France might, in fact, be mistaken in its allegiance to the Avignon papacy. Convinced that the Roman contender was the true pontiff, Constance appealed to the count of Foix to install the correct pope and lead King Charles VI in a conquest of the Holy Land.[30] Bridget of Sweden fits into this bothersome profile—indeed, she surpasses her predecessors in general noisomeness (at least from Gerson's perspective) by backing the English in the Hundred Years War in two celebrated revelations.[31]

Gerson's *adfeminam* approach to discernment was also linked to his aspirations for the scholar and the university at large. Gerson had periodically acknowledged that illiterates, particularly women, often outstripped the learned cleric in contemplative gifts.[32] Although he was prepared to grant this apparent advantage among the unlearned, it was nevertheless an ongoing source of consternation and even chagrin. Thus Gerson acknowledges, "For even uneducated wretched little women and ignorant people who cannot read or write [*etiam mulierculae et idiotae sine litteris*] have the capacity of ascending to and obtaining this type of contemplation, assuming a simple faith. It is much easier for them than for men of great intelligence who are learned in theology."[33] Later, however, Gerson recoiled from the thought that the intricacies of what he referred to as "mystical theology" should be vetted in popular for a. "Are [these matters] to be made public, now in writings, now in talk in the vernacular language among servants, uneducated youths, slow-witted old people, the uneducated crowd, broken-down old women, at one time in the market-place, at another in the back streets? Are men who are quite learned, both in ability and training, to be kept from speaking about such matters because they are schoolmen?"[34] His defensiveness on behalf of scholastic prerogative was additionally colored by his desire

to reform the university by promoting his special brand of academic mysticism and simultaneously suppressing the unhealthy scholarly curiosity that he so roundly despised.[35] To this end, he had begun lecturing on mysticism already in 1402 and writing scholarly treatises on the subject.[36] Moreover, at the end of the Council of Constance, when his efforts to destabilize Bridget's reputation for sanctity proved unsuccessful, Gerson composed several treatises discrediting the sensory visions that were the cornerstone of female mysticism.[37] Thus he argues that deep meditative imaginings on corporeal things can lead to insanity. Abetted by demonic interpolation, inner and outer objects become indistinguishable, and such fantasies lead to profound confusion and error so that "either in the elevation of the body of Christ or in another of their reveries they judge that they really saw Christ crucified or in some other corporeal form."[38] Sensitive to what he must have perceived as one of the more pernicious of scholarly quibbles, Gerson deliberately opposed the view that a person was exculpated or, worse still, won merit in worshiping a demonic Christ. Such a misapprehension was a mortal sin—a position that contrasts with Gerson's more forgiving view regarding the papal schism when he argues that good intentions would be credited.[39]

For all practical purposes, Gerson's strategies for containment of rogue scholars and female mystics alike were inseparable. Both groups were afflicted by the same failings. Curiosity and a love of novelty were destroying academic inquiry, thereby weakening the faith; the female mystic's parallel curiosity and love of novelty, failings she shared with her overindulgent clerical advisers, in addition to jeopardizing her own soul, were giving rise to public scandal and likewise undermining the faith. From this perspective, Gerson's conflation of the two issues into a single exemplum is especially revealing. In the same treatise in which we encounter the sophistical Satan, Gerson goes on to argue that Satan's skill in theology was especially apparent in the persona of the prophetess who attempted to validate the mission of Paul and his apostles—a gesture of goodwill that they, of course, spurned (Acts 16.16). But, as Gerson points out, by checking her authority, Paul was simultaneously undermining her financial value to her patrons. Their reaction was to persecute Paul and his companions with gusto. Gerson likens clerics who promote "the false miracles and revelations of these wretched little women" to the spiritual pimps from Acts.[40] Such dangerous tendencies could be arrested, however, by an appropriate reapplication of scholarly interest to a more vigorous form of mystical contemplation—one in which the discernment of spirits constituted the cornerstone. Scholarly curiosity would thus be rechanneled into suppressing rather than abetting female mystical curiosity.

What Gerson was proposing was something like a hostile male "take-over" of an area of considerable female accomplishment, comparable to the way in which male artisans crowded women out of female-dominated crafts, once they became lucrative.[41] In this context, it should be reiterated that his guidelines require that an assessor of mystical phenomena have the advantage of both practical experience and theological training. This set of requirements would, by necessity, exclude women, who were barred from the universities. Interestingly, the experiential criterion may very well have excluded Gerson, who never claims that he himself was the recipient of mystical experiences.[42] But the fact that he did not disqualify himself as a judge suggests that theological training is really what counted, even though this flies in the face of the apostolic designation of spiritual discernment as a gift of the spirit (1 Cor. 12.10). Indeed, Gerson even posited that those entirely lacking in experience with mystical phenomena might make the best judges—a situation that he likens to the superiority of the medical theorist over the practitioner, or to the lot of a blind man whose enhanced powers of cognitive reasoning exist in proportion to the extent of his visual impairment.[43] That no parallel claims were to be allowed for the purely experiential side is clear from Gerson's account of a woman, "a prophetess and a maker of miracles," whom he met. In response to his question about how she knew that her spirit was annihilated and entirely recreated in the course of contemplation, she answered that she had experienced it—an answer that Gerson clearly regarded as so ludicrous that it required no further comment.[44] In short, Gerson was training what Foucault might describe as a "fellowship of discourse" animated by the "prodigious machinery of the will to truth with its vocation of exclusion."[45] This team of professionals would be equipped to pronounce on the validity of female religious experience, with a view toward containment.[46]

Thus far the focus has been on the possible motives informing Gerson's prejudice against female mystical expression. But there were also a number of methodological and ideological constructs that shaped the way in which this bias manifested itself. Of paramount importance was the level of contestation integral to scholastic discourse. Gerson was clearly critical of many perceived abuses of scholasticism. Aware of the inescapable violence inherent in scholastic discourse, Gerson further denounced the often pointless aggression that such methods fostered. His treatise *One Hundred Utterances concerning Impulses* condemns the urge toward deception rife among preachers and writers, which Gerson associates with a "shameless fantasy that . . . seeks machinations for conquest."[47]

Of course, this apprehension over the dangers of scholasticism did not interfere with Gerson's own deft deployment of incisive rhetorical

weaponry. As discussed above, all scholars trained in dialectic were adept at subverting any positive "case" by arguing to the opposite purpose, and Gerson was no exception. The *adfeminam* twist to Gerson's discourse on discernment is a case in point: *On the Proving of Spirits* is basically a reworking of a treatise *defending* the inspiration of Bridget's revelations, a work written by her confessor and literary executor, Alphonse of Pecha (d. 1389).[48] In essence, scholastic argumentation leaves a shadow text of discarded or disproved tenets that invite ingenious appropriation. Gerson's subversion was skilled, but routine. Yet a shadow text can, as we shall see, coalesce and take shape in much more alarming and unpredictable ways.

In tandem with the scholarly apparatus associated with Gerson's theological training was the ongoing penetration of the inquisitional process into many different areas of Christian life, a process facilitated in learned circles by the remarkable symmetry between the *disputatio* and the *inquisitio*. It was but a matter of course that Gerson would look to an inquisitorial tribunal to discipline and reform errant scholars and mystics alike, a parallelism that is particularly stressed in the treatise *On the Examination of Doctrine*, discussed below.

Gerson's frequent appeals to the medical tradition further shaped his writings. As we have seen, he was prepared to grant that women were possessed of greater piety than men. In keeping with his adherence to the Platonic dictum that "souls follow bodies," Gerson assigned a physiological reason for women's spiritual aptitude. He thus enlists the principal affections issuing from the powers of the soul, a concept also derived from Plato, to explain spiritual dispositions. Women were dominated by the concupiscible power, as opposed to the rational or the irascible. Thus women were reckoned as softhearted and easily drawn into contemplation through a consideration of Christ's passion, God's love, or the joys and sufferings of saints' lives, hence "often called pious and devout."[49] But this propensity was a mixed blessing. For throughout the corpus of Gerson's work he stressed over and over again the danger of the contemplative life's devolving into melancholia, phantasms, and mania.[50]

There are also certain hierarchical and philosophical considerations to Gerson's discourse. By isolating woman per se as more prone to error, and thus particularly requiring pastoral vigilance, Gerson was following the structural logic of his own thrust toward exemplification. The learned, male, clerical judge calls out for its counterpart: the unlearned, female, lay, defendant.[51] Insofar as this pairing corresponded to the contours of his prescribed hierarchy in discernment, this was a logical and controlled benefit of Gerson's marked tendency to use women as exempla.

Finally, the implications of casting women as negative exemplars

necessarily reached beyond the compass of Gerson's work to the larger discursive terrain of misogyny. The general outlines of this discourse are familiar to us all.[52] First, there is the polarization in representations of women. Even as abstract and frequently positive concepts like philosophy, wisdom, or truth tend toward female representation, so instances of folly seek reification in a female subject.Woman's capacity for negative exemplarity is not only conditioned by her perceived overembodiment, as implied by her reproductive capacity. It is also buttressed by theological and medical traditions that saw woman as a "bad copy" of man—hence the familiar bent rib syndrome.[53] Moreover, the fall of humanity was, arguably, predicated on the inadequacy of Eve's faculty of discernment in the first place, a defect that rendered her an easy mark for the predatory suasions of Lucifer. In short, once Gerson moved the tradition of spiritual discernment in the direction he did, the very weight of woman's mottled representational legacy would open the way to unlimited elaboration. The momentum would make this development difficult to resist, let alone reverse. In fact, there was no mechanism for its reversal, since there was no alternative to substitute for woman as an ideal type of negatively valenced weak-minded carnality. As a result, the literature of spiritual discernment would become the prisoner of the misogynistic tradition: woman would come to embody the duplicity or "doubleness" that was afflicting Christendom, and would thus become the target for its doubts and self-loathing.

As his first-person exempla suggest, Gerson's efforts on discernment were frequently put into practice. His reputation as a reliable assessor seems already to have been established in 1401 or 1402, when he received an appeal from the prior of the abbey of Saint-Denys of Reims, John Morel, concerning the recently deceased holy woman Ermine of Reims.[54] Gerson's response to this case establishes a strategy that will recur in his later dealings with female mystics, particularly Joan of Arc.[55] Morel was very anxious to have Gerson's reactions to the record of the life and visions of Ermine. A model of scholarly method, Gerson's analysis is shaped into three conclusions (which, in turn, keep dividing down into triplicates), all of which are devoted to limitation, containment, and damage control. In the first conclusion, Gerson posits that the book contains nothing contrary to Scripture, while similar occurrences are found in the lives of the fathers. Second, although the contents of her visions were not essential to an individual's salvation, "I think, nevertheless, that it is rash and crude to insist on dissenting from such things or to attack them with stubborn ill will."[56] Third, the book should not be widely circulated but should be limited to those who would be edified by its

contents. The restricted audience is called for, allegedly, out of respect for the book's contents: "so that what is holy not be cast to the dogs, as pearls are thrown before swine (Matt. 7.6)." An ideal audience would consist of "those who are stable in their way of life and concerned with their own salvation"—in other words, individuals who could easily dispense with such a model.[57] Against her supernatural foes, Ermine is fortified by a triplicate set of virtues. The first is her profound humility, which stimulated "a most passionate and conscientious awareness of her own weakness and imperfection." Second, her life demonstrates the ultimate safety that an unwavering faith imparts. Third, her prudent but unlearned simplicity is particularly commended: "an untaught wisdom, which does not depend on its own prudence but does all things with counsel (Prov. 13.10)."[58] In the context of Gerson's subsequent treatises on discernment, this final characteristic may be seen as the cornerstone to his approval: truly ignorant, but knows it! Docile, and ductile, she can do no harm.

From first to last, Gerson's cautious endorsement of Ermine exemplifies scholarly prudence. Consistent with his own concern for authenticity, it concludes by drawing attention to his signature as proof of his authorship. 59 As a whole, the letter is safely couched in the context of Morel's request (which was described as repeated and even importunate), while much of the "work" of the letter is to establish Gerson as an evenhanded assessor, as opposed to an enthusiastic supporter. If subsequent events caused him to regret his decision, his earlier opinions had been sufficiently sotto voce to make a reversal possible.

And such a reversal did eventually occur. In the final treatise that addresses the question of discernment directly, *On the Examination of Doctrine* (1423), Gerson cautions particularly against easily crediting those who use their purported revelations in usurping the right to teach and promote their own claims to sanctity. Women, especially laywomen, are singled out. It is in this context that Ermine's name is invoked.

> There are many others who . . . wish to deceive others by fashioning marvels . . . and insofar as I am an expert who speaks often, if I wished to report or to write, a great effect that book would have and it would be a marvel among the curious. Blessed God preserved me many times from seduction [*a seductione*] from the mockery and contempt of such ones. I confess that earlier I was near seduction [*proximus seductioni*] over a certain Ermine of Reims through the relations of some men possessed of great reputations—if I had not, with God willing, tempered the

> manner of my response. Around that time, I compiled a little work or reading concerning the distinction of true revelations from false.[60]

This passage is extremely revealing: God is seen as the custodian ensuring Gerson's credibility as the "expert who speaks often." Gerson is thus divinely spared various "seductions"—be they the derision of the curious, or the more potent lure of Ermine and her puissant supporters. God's intervention is particularly manifest in the fact that Gerson "tempered the manner of [his] response." Thus his measured method of discernment receives a kind of divine ratification.

We are not told what specifically led to Gerson's disillusionment with Ermine. Nor is it at all certain whether his shifting perspective directly prompted the treatise on discernment to which he refers, or whether he was still riding the crest of his modest wave of support for Ermine.[61] But his initial caution and his ultimate reversal both appear to be motivated by the fear of being duped by a fake or "bad copy." This fear informs his attraction to the rhetoric of authentic coins versus counterfeits in *On Distinguishing True from False Revelations*. Indeed, Gerson builds his entire treatise around this metaphor. "We are to be like spiritual money-changers or merchants. With skill and care we examine the precious and unfamiliar coin of divine revelation, in order to find out whether demons, who strive to corrupt and counterfeit any divine and good coin, smuggle in a false and base coin instead of the true and legitimate one."[62] Moreover, his leading example is, arguably, the most compelling instance of impostorship perpetrated amid the desert fathers and one extremely germane to a late medieval milieu: a series of incidents in which the devil disguises himself as Christ. The fathers are not deceived, and they answer: " 'I do not wish to see Christ on earth. I will be happy to see him in heaven,' " or variations thereof.[63] The implication is not only that any credible mystic would exercise parallel skepticism with respect to super-natural visitors, but that Gerson's readers should manifest similar caution with the mystic.

The image of the money changer perfectly adumbrates Gerson's approach to discernment, while securely anchoring it within tradition. From patristic times, the art of discernment had been likened to the task of the *numeralius* or money changer, whose profession required him to authenticate or "prove" coins by testing them in a fire—an image that had the advantage of corresponding to the way in which God "proves" his elect.[64] In addition to enlisting the weighty validation imparted by the unassailable biblical and patristic legacy, the imagery surrounding this form of authentication also had affinities with the scholastic methodology itself and the potential parallels between the analogous functions of money changer and scholar. Both

sets of professionals were fully apprised of the alarming fact that once the counterfeit coin was introduced into a particular economy—be it fiscal, intellectual, or spiritual—it would circulate like any other coin, inexorably contaminating all that it touched.[65] In order to avert this, the money changer had "to prove" (*probare*) gold in a fire, just as the scholar "proved" a proposition by assailing it with various objections. Gerson proceeds to establish a set of metallurgically informed metaphors for proof of authenticity.[66]

Gerson's caution with regard to Ermine is at one with the strategy pursued in his most celebrated treatise on discernment, *On the Proving of Spirits*—a title both invoking Paul's biblical injunction and subtly sustaining the image of the money changer. In this work, his challenge of Bridget of Sweden's recent canonization is subtly couched in a triple set of dangers: the risk that the council may approve visions that are imagined and false; the potential scandal of suppressing a cult to which many already adhere; and the danger in silence. Gerson's response is to propose his "middle ground," consisting of the ensuing guidelines for discernment. 67 While acknowledging in passing that some can discern spirits on the basis of inspiration by the Holy Spirit alone, the treatise is nevertheless focused on what he lists as the first method of discernment: "the norms from holy scripture and those proposed by good men [*viros*] well versed in it."[68] He reduces his method to six terse principles of inquiry to be applied to the probation of mystic and revelations alike. These he summarizes in a little ditty (which rhymed in the Latin original): "Ask who, what, why / To whom, what kind, whence?" The following gloss is then given:"*Who* is it to whom the revelation is made? *What* does the revelation itself mean and to what does it refer? *Why* is it said to have taken place? *To whom* was it manifested for advice? *What kind of life* does the visionary lead? *Whence* does the revelation originate?"[69] In this line of questioning, we can decipher the familiar contours of interrogation associated with the inquisitional procedure and, ultimately, its diverse uses.[70] Thus later in the same treatise, when Gerson comments on the indispensability of theologians to processes of canonization, he automatically brings to mind its inquisitionally constituted ethos.[71]

Beyond the various dangers to which Gerson alludes at the outset of *On the Proving of Spirits* is the tacit or suppressed danger that Gerson's view might ultimately be rejected by the assembly—which is, in a sense, what occurred. And since the Council of Constance did, eventually, approve Bridget and her revelations, it is just as well that Gerson simply posed Bridget and her ilk as a *quaestio*, for which he provided the appropriate apparatus but not the solution.

The inquisitional allusions are taken up with still greater vehemence in the final treatise, *On the Examination of Doctrine*. It is here that

Gerson calls for a more "particular inquisition" of a confessor's overly partial testimony at a deceased penitent's process of canonization.[72] He also notes that if "a great inquisition" occurs over the purveyors of heretical opinion, how much more apt this would be for the screening of new teachings, be they lay or clerical, theological or canonical, during the person's lifetime rather than after death "so that the living person may be corrected if any error were discovered." This was an odd position for the chancellor of the University of Paris to assume. Gerson himself recognized that such inquisitorially sponsored censorship struck at the heart of the medieval university's own notion of academic freedom. He accordingly anticipates that "the usual protests [will] ring out that this exactitude should be performed on public acts of sacred theology. This is what the person means when he says: I may write heretical material, but I would [still] not be a heretic [*haereticare potero, sedhaereticus non ero*]. Why this concern? After all, nobody is a heretic unless pertinacious."[73] While Gerson may have correctly predicted the outcry that his suggestion would elicit, his attempts to allay his outraged colleagues' fears seem sadly insufficient.

This latter treatise is the one that denounces Ermine by name, further underlining the uniform action he recommended for wayward scholars and mystics alike, while leaving little doubt about the very high price Gerson assigned to credulity in female visions. His critique of confessors who sponsor their female penitents' cults is followed by an admonition to clerics against ceding authority to women and half-wits. This point is punctuated with the example of Gregory XI who, in extremis with his hand on the consecrated host, bemoaned his own adherence to certain mystics whom Gerson refrains from naming, though clearly alluding to Bridget of Sweden and Catherine of Siena, whose deluded advice precipitated the papal schism.[74]

THE CHANCELLOR, THE MAID, AND THE MOMENTUM OF DISCOURSE

Over the years Gerson had the opportunity to refine considerably his scholarly technique of spiritual discernment. But when he attempted to use this mechanism in a different way, he learned that he was less its master than he might have supposed. I am referring to his attempt to use it for purposes of vindication, perhaps even sanctification, in the case of Joan of Arc.[75] Try as he might to adapt his discourse of discernment to an alternative and more exculpatory purpose, he was to discover himself, like the captain of the *Titanic*, unable to change its course or to overcome its inevitable inertia before he hit the iceberg.

For this discursive trajectory had been carefully plotted. Uniting the exacting requirements for academic proof with the uniformity of an

inquisition, Gerson's approach procedurally demanded the seeming disinterest of the inquisitor, rather than the overt ardor of a potential apologist. This would be in keeping with his disparagement of a confessor's bias in favor of his holy charge. From Gerson's perspective, this disinterest not only added the sheen of credibility to the endeavor; it also provided the essential room to maneuver in the event that the judge had to revoke an earlier decision. But, ultimately, Gerson's machine was built to generate negatively valenced judgments. Fueled as it was by objections, careful considerations, and doubt, it was better adapted to producing condemnations than vindications, even as it was more successful at identifying heretics than identifying saints.

Twenty-eight years after his regretted endorsement of Ermine of Reims, fourteen years after his scuttled attempt to undermine Bridget of Sweden's canonization, Gerson, writing in exile in Lyons as an enemy of the now ascendant Anglo-Burgundian party, set about vindicating the divine source of Joan of Arc's inspiration.[76] But Gerson's investment is reflected inversely in the degree of reasoned detachment he affects in his treatise. (And I should say at the outset that it is these devices of detachment I am concerned with, rather than the arguments Gerson mobilizes for her defense.) The opening of the treatise sets the tone:

> Over the deed of the maid and the credulity fit to be extended to her, it ought to be supposed in the first place that many false things are probable—indeed according to the Philosopher it is proposed that false things are more probable than certain true ones to the extent that contradictory things are the same in degree of probability though not in truth. [Second] It ought to be further heeded that probability, if rightly founded and understood, ought not to be called an error or erroneous unless its assertion is pertinaciously extended beyond the limits of probability. . . .Athird consideration arises concerning faith and good morals, which creates a twofold difference. . . . Some things are said for the necessity of faith, and these admit of no doubt or conjecture of probability, according to popular judgment: doubt in faith is infidelity. . . . Different again are those things in the faith or of the faith that are called for by piety or devotion, but in no way from necessity: concerning which things it can be said in the common tongue: he who doesn't believe it, isn't damned.[77]

In this rather involuted opening, the mechanisms of skepticism are finely tuned in the extreme—establishing Gerson's disinterested right

to judge, while simultaneously building into his defense of Joan a generous escape clause for himself. He secures this latter condition by enlisting the Aristotelian supposition that the realm of the probable invariably overshadows the actual, at the same time maintaining that (despite its extreme fallibility) a position based on probability is not an error. Gerson proceeds to underline the compulsory nature of the articles of the faith with an explicit, albeit unavowed, citation from the *Decretals* of Gregory IX.[78] The noncompulsory nature of popular devotion is, by contrast, signified by a popular adage in the vernacular. In other words, if Gerson is wrong in his subsequent support of Joan (and the laws of probability are against him, as he himself points out), he is not in error. By the same token, neither does anyone who refuses to believe in Joan err.[79]

Even after weaving this elaborate safety net, Gerson still demurs, instead proceeding to outline certain conditions for establishing the merit of an object of devotion: that the cult leads to greater piety; that probability is established on the basis of reliable eyewitnesses; and that the matter is screened by a theologian.[80] In other words, his criteria for whether or not Joan's deed is worthy of veneration closely track those used for the canonization of saints.[81] At this juncture, he takes a second opportunity to point to the disagreement among experts regarding matters of piety—vexed questions such as the conception of the Virgin Mary.

Only now is Gerson prepared to undertake his assessment of Joan's claims. In brief, he argues that belief in the deed of the Maid can be maintained by its excellent outcome: the restitution of the kingdom and the repulsion of France's enemies. Certain attendant circumstances weigh in her favor: she does not use witchcraft and she takes risks on behalf of a worthy cause.

At this point, Gerson momentarily breaks off his defense to address the many malicious rumors circulating against Joan, answering with a line from Cato's *Distichs* to the effect that he need not concern himself with judging what everyone else says.[82] "But," Gerson continues, "we do have to judge what ought to be believed or upheld, maintaining prudence and pushing contention and sedition far away for, as the Apostle says, a servant of God does not litigate." Thus, underlining his function as disinterested judge, he posits that either these discussions must be tolerated, or the matter should be referred to religious superiors, as is the case with the canonization of saints. He again takes the opportunity to note that while veneration of particular cults is not a requirement of the faith, still they ought not to be derided. Indeed, a canonized saint warrants more respect than his or her popular but unauthorized counterpart.

The apology is again resumed: the Maid has the faith of the king

and his council, creates exultation in the people, increases their piety, and inspires fear in the enemy.[83] Neither she nor her followers are imprudent, willful, or stubborn. They are not tempting God; in fact, the Maid takes her directions and warnings from God. He likens her to other religious heroines such as Deborah, Saint Catherine, or Judith. Even if there is no sequel to her initial miraculous success, this does not signify that her achievements were wrought by an evil spirit: it could well be that France's own sinfulness aborted God's goodness. Finally, he concludes with four "civil and theological" considerations in her favor: the king and his relatives, the French army, the clergy and the laity, and the Maid herself—the purpose of each being to live well and piously for God. Neither the Maid nor her followers exploit God's grace through focusing on "vain curiosities," worldly gain, or glory. Rather, she displays the grace of God in her selflessness and piety, and her work for peace in France. He concludes simply: "This deed was done by God."[84]

Appended to the treatise proper is an additional threefold defense of Joan's assumption of masculine garb, the conclusion of which is especially germane.[85] Warning that France's skeptical ingratitude for Joan's victory may result in the withdrawal of divine assistance, Gerson ends with this observation: "For God changes his sentence as a result of a change in merit, even if he does not change his counsel."[86] Such a sentiment also leaves room for Gerson to change his sentence on Joan, yet his advice concerning spiritual discernment would have remained admirably consistent.

THE LAWS OF INERTIA AND THE EVIL TWIN

In no time at all Gerson's treatise—redolent of his own latent ambivalence and couched in the tacitly reversible language of scholasticism—spawned a double condemning Joan. The timing was very tight. Gerson's treatise proper is dated 14 May 1429—that is, six days after the successful battle of Orléans and a mere two months before Gerson's own death. By the end of the summer, the Anglo-Burgundian party would create its own response to Gerson's defense.[87] Originating at the University of Paris, now solidly pro-English, this is the first piece of evidence indicating the university's interest in Joan of Arc. This institutional concern should certainly be construed as a frightening confirmation of the success of Gerson's former initiative on discernment. His various treatments of the subject, in addition to his university-sponsored lectures on mysticism, had fostered a generation of discerning protégés. The anonymous treatise's full command of its tools is reflected in the title, *On the Goodandthe Evil Spirit*.[88]

This tract is a veritable evil twin of Gerson's work in every sense of

the word, not merely of the treatise defending Joan, but of all his former endeavors on spiritual discernment. Even its most basic strategy, the simple inversion of a defense into an attack, was one that we have witnessed Gerson employing in his negative recasting of Alphonse of Pecha's defense of Bridget of Sweden. The Anglo-Burgundian treatise existed in similar parasitical relation to Gerson's originary host.

With a view to exploitation, the anonymous author was also quick to comprehend where Gerson had left himself most vulnerable: the constant recourse to the cult of saints. Throughout his treatise, Gerson had relied on contemporary criteria for canonization to assess Joan's achievement, making perceptions of sanctity central to his defense of Joan. While the often reiterated reminder of the noncompulsory nature of veneration simultaneously softened his claims on her behalf, this position was largely sustained by his contrasting pious but optional devotion with compulsory adherence to church doctrine. Dissent in the latter category was inexcusable and "ought finally to be exterminated by iron and fire, according to the ecclesiastical sentences carried out against heretics. This point can be made with a useful proverb: Fame, faith, and the eye do not suffer tricks."[89]

The appeal to contemporary criteria of sanctity and heresy, and the common set of procedures intended to separate the two poles, were on a continuum with Gerson's earlier insistence that living teachers be subjected to a "great inquisition." Even so, it was a false step. Credence in the divinely inspired nature of Joan's mission was seemingly inseparable from claims on behalf of her divine inspiration. By likening faith in Joan's mission to the pious veneration of saints, Gerson had sprung the trap that had been anticipated and skirted by canny hagiographers like James of Vitry or Thomas of Cantimpréwho, despite their intention of creating a category of living saint, dared only to eulogize such women after their demise. Gerson, however, was leaving Joan insufficiently insulated from charges that she was or believed herself to be worthy of veneration—a level of hubris that would immediately point to her unworthiness.

The anonymous *On the Good and Evil Spirit* eagerly took up the gauntlet from where Gerson had unfortunately let it drop, at once beginning with an avowed citation of Gregory IX's *Decretals*, affirming the solidarity of orthodoxy and condemning superstitious novelties.[90] Those who give credence to the claims that the Maid and her mission are divinely inspired are acting without the evidence of miracles or the testimony of the Scripture, thus willfully contravening canon law, even as the Maid's claims should lay her open to suspicions of heresy.[91] Had she truly been sent by God, she would hardly wear male clothing. Indeed, her defenders' claims that her male clothing is

dictated by her mission are not only guilty of attempting to defend a sin; they even fail in their exculpatory function, since many evil things are done under the guise of good. A woman's assumption of male dress is described as "an unrestrained opportunity for fornicating and performing manly acts."[92] Moreover, the true faith would never be party to such a scandal, even if it meant the loss of France to the English.[93]

In turning to the alleged benefits produced by the Maid's deed, the counterattack quickens. The anonymous author claims that Joan is hardly an agent of peace; hostilities have in fact increased since her appearance, while Joan herself is bellicose and immoral. God would never have incited her to undertake a battle on the Assumption and the Nativity of the Virgin Mary, proof that her inspiration was diabolical. More damning still is the allegation that Joan has permitted children to offer her candles on bended knee, thereby encouraging the sin of idolatry.[94] Indeed, the anonymous cleric goes on to argue that already in many regions, actual images of Joan are being venerated as if she were dead and canonized—an outrage against the faith since no one may be honored as a saint while still living. Nor should an individual be publicly venerated after death unless already canonized.[95] He thus argues that Joan's position is contrary to the faith, and then proceeds to invoke, by inversion, Gerson's words twice in quick succession, pointing to the dire consequences of Joan's behavior. First, the proverb "Fame, faith, and the eye do not suffer tricks" is cited. In this instance, however, it is no longer intended to accentuate the distance between noncompulsory veneration and compulsory articles of the faith, thus removing all necessity from belief in Joan's mission. Rather, it is used to demonstrate that Joan, in permitting herself to be worshiped, has crossed a line and become a danger to the faith. He then reverses Gerson's contention that the deed of the Maid can be supported, as Gerson put it, "with the piety of the Catholic faith and sincere devotion," instead using the same phrase to argue that she moves the simple to disrepect of God, imperiling their souls and subverting the faith.[96] This contention is but-tressed by the demonstration of a link between idolatry and witchcraft:

> Likewise . . . she seems to use sorcery . . . when the aforesaid innocents offered the wax candles to her with the aforesaid veneration, she occasioned three drops of wax from that burning candle to be dropped over the heads of those making the offering, predicting to them that good would come to them from the virtue of that act, and thus the aforesaid offering is deemed idolatrous and such a dropping is heresy with sorcery involved. And for that

> reason it concerns the inquisitor for the faith, by reason of his office, to inquire about the crime of heresy and punish.[97]

With this blatant accusation of heresy, the author enjoins the university, bishop, and inquisitor to unite in suppressing the error. The legalistic momentum is briefly interrupted by a quotation from *The Remedies for Love*: "resist beginnings; too late is the medicine prepared." But there is a bizarre appropriateness to this Ovidian interlude. This violently misogynistic work, a favorite in university circles, professed to teach men how best to resist the wiles of female seduction.[98] Moreover, Ovid's pseudomedicinal strain sets up the canonistic climax to the treatise, which urges that "the putrid flesh should be cut off, and the scabby beasts repelled from the sheepfold"—an explicit citation from Gratian's *Decretum*.[99] This conclusion, and the authority invoked, are in keeping with a central strategy of the treatise, which was to move the entire discourse more solidly into the orbit of canon law. And indeed, every one of its harsh contentions was buttressed by recourse to canonical procedure with heretics.

FALSE GERSON, FALSE JOAN

A question mark has traditionally hung over the authenticity of Gerson's treatise, complementing the saturation of the entire discussion with anxieties about forgery and counterfeit.[100] His legacy in spiritual discernment definitely helped to foster these doubts, since his resistance to female mysticism made him an unlikely advocate for Joan.[101] Indeed, the cautious tenor of Gerson's defense (though, as I have implied, one of the signs of its authenticity) was sufficiently disappointing that Dorothy Wayman posited that the treatise in question was not the work of Gerson at all but a literal "bad copy" written from memory by an Anglo-Burgundian spy so that his side could refute Gerson's original.[102] It is further discredited, in her eyes, by the fact that it "picks out for mention and argument the very points on which the Paris theologians at the Rouen Trial would find her guilty of heresy and witchcraft."[103] Ironically, it was the twentieth-century discovery of its anonymous evil twin—*On the Good and Evil Spirit*—and its antiphonal connection with Gerson's work that did much toward vindicating the authenticity of Gerson's treatise.[104]

The antiphonal relationship of the two treatises is indicative of Gerson's mixed legacy in spiritual discernment, generally, and female spirituality in particular. Not only was Gerson's scholastic-inquisitorial approach a methodological triumph, but his additional recourse to the misogynistic tradition had sufficiently undermined the validity of female spirituality that "authentic" female spirituality could no longer

exist without being subjected to this procedure. Thus Gerson had attempted to formalize the ad hoc inquiries periodically practiced on women with miraculous claims to sainthood, like the stigmatic Elisabeth of Spalbeek, and extend their application. Many more living women, ostensibly orthodox, were to be judged by the same inquisitional standard that was largely the domain of church criminals, heretics, or dead candidates for sainthood. The anonymous cleric thus capitalized on Gerson's earlier spadework, additionally reversing his argument and realizing its potential for self-entrapment.

According to an anonymous summary of Joan's trial of condemnation, produced around 1500, Gerson's assessment of Joan was registered at the proceedings as an authoritative and dissenting voice that contradicted the other theologians from Paris, who are described as condemning her "to flatter and please the king of England." But this account was penned with all the obstinate blindness of wishful hindsight, recasting history in light of Joan's recent trial of rehabilitation, undertaken in 1450, at which Gerson's treatise was produced.[105] In fact, Gerson's treatise, which could more securely argue the claims of a dead than of a living defendant, had finally found its rightful audience. But given Latin Christendom's age-old cavils against the veneration of a living person, as long as Joan lived, Gerson's treatise—with its explicit alignment of Joan's activities with the deeds of saints—played into the hands of her enemies.

The antagonistic relation between Gerson and his anonymous critic reenacts the forces of bifurcation at work in Christendom in general and in the realm of female spirituality in particular. The conflict itself sketched out the possibility of two Joans: the one pious, good, and inspired by God; the other evil, depraved, and demonically inspired. This possibility was ultimately realized in a flesh-and-blood double. In 1436, five years after Joan's execution at the hands of a pro-English heretical inquisitional tribunal, the celebrated "false Joan" emerged. A female warrior, initially calling herself Claude but eventually appropriating Joan's name and even her identity, managed to convince a number of people, including Joan's (one can only believe) craven brothers, that she had miraculously evaded death.[106] The false Joan's status as "real" also sustains an interesting double entendre: sufficient contemporaneous sources assure us that she did, in fact, exist. And yet the false Joan could be construed as a discursive remainder—confected from language's inability to exhaust the recesses of the Lacanian "Real."[107]

The false Joan was active between 1436 and 1440. But already around 1437, well before her drama had played itself out, John Nider's extremely influential *Formicarium* attempted to absorb and resecure the anomaly that she represented within the literature of

spiritual discernment. Nider's *Formicarium* was intended to alert the clerical community to the many kinds of spiritual and moral depravity on the loose in contemporary Christendom. The rubric introducing the category under which Joan was to be discussed suggests how her example would be mobilized in the context of the work's pastoral aims:

> How venereal delectation ought to be fled. Concerning women under a virile form saying publicly that they have been sent by God. And concerning the three things that rarely hold the middle: the tongue, an ecclesiastic, and a woman, who in good things is best but in bad things becomes the worst.[108]

Beginning with a disquisition on how certain ants feed on cadavers, a predilection he likens to those who enjoy perverse lusts, Nider further associates such practices with men who are attracted to the female sinner. "The Disciple" of the dialogue is suddenly inspired to ask, "Are there in our time any good men deceived by magicians or witches, according to your judgment?" This question directly prompts Theologus to respond with an anecdote he had heard recently from his confrere the inquisitor Henry Kalteisen about "Claude," the False Joan. First appearing in Cologne, this cross-dressed woman conducted herself as a man in revelry and in arms. Interestingly, she offered to intervene in a contemporary episcopal case of doubling: "At that time the church see of Trier had two men contending for it, and was gravely troubled, and she boasted that she was willing and able to enthrone one of the parties; just as the virgin Joan (about whom immediately it was said) did with the French King Charles a little earlier, confirming him in his own kingdom. Indeed, the woman affirmed she was that same Joan, revived by God."[109]Our female warrior's general demeanor, compounded by certain magical tricks she liked to play, attracted the attention of the aforementioned inquisitor. She very soon beat a hasty retreat, first into France where she married a knight, but then moving on to Metz, where she became a priest's concubine, "which clearly showed by which spirit she was led." With no further ado, Nider enters into his summary of Joan of Arc's career. The "original" Joan is thus presented as a sequel to the "false" Joan. Nider, however, characteristically recuses himself from passing explicit judgment on the "original" Joan. Instead, he foregrounds Joan as a disputed question, in need of resolution: "Laypeople, clerics, and monks all were in doubt as to what spirit ruled her, diabolical or divine."[110] Joan has, in fact, literally and metaphorically been "framed" in such a way that the reader almost has to pronounce against her. In a certain sense, the rhetorically

constrained reader has been "framed" as well, forced to do the work of the inquisitor.

As representative of the literature of spiritual discernment, Nider's *Formicarium* prolongs many Gersonian initiatives.[111] Peopled by Nider's acquaintances, conveying their reminiscences as well as his own, is a veritable tabloid of contemporary spiritual events. But, as with the modern tabloid, one has to remember that what is more accessible is not necessarily uncomplicated in its affiliations and final effects. Nider's engagement with the contemporary instance of these widely celebrated doubles draws upon some of the most sophisticated discursive practices of his day. He relies upon the convention of scholarly detachment, which was so important to Gerson, by refusing to choose between the two Joans. Indeed, his bifurcated depiction is generated by those forms of scholastic argument that encourage the production of a monstrous opposite as the double of any positive representation.

This bifurcation—explored in Gerson's defense of Joan and its anonymous opposite—may be glimpsed in Nider just as it once again disappears from view. For the interdependence of the positive and negative Joans raises the likelihood of their ultimate reconvergence. In Nider's rendition, the distance between the false Joan and the "authentic" Joan of Arc finally disappears, as these inherently unstable positive and negative binaries dissolve into a single flawed entity. The lost possibility of Joan's authentic and uncorrupted spirituality coincides with the first stages of a more pervasive effacement of Europe's faith in positive female spirituality.

[1] Birger Bergh, ed., *Sancta Birgitta Revelaciones Book V* (Uppsala: Almquist and Wiksells, 1971), pp. 97–98; trans. by Albert Kezel, *Birgitta of Sweden: Life and Selected Revelations* (New York: Paulist Press, 1990), p. 101.

[2] Note that Christ characterizes the monk's questions as *inquisicio tua* (ibid. bk. 5, interr. 6.6, resp. ad 1, p. 107; trans. Kezel, p. 108).

[3] For his continued influence into the early modern period, see Anne Schutte, *Aspiring Saints: Pretense of Holiness, Inquisition, and Gender in the Republic of Venice, 1618–1750* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), pp. 44 ff.

[4] I differ from Hohman in this respect. He notes that Gerson does invoke Henry in the context of the latter's opposition to the multiplication of saints (on this, see n. 21, below). But I think the parallels indicate direct influence. Gerson's enlistment of the Job citation, discussed below, seems particularly telling—especially if one considers that the evocation of Henry's name comes just after his use of the biblical citation (Gerson, *De probatione spirituum* c. 8, in *Oeuvres*, 9:181); see Thomas Hohman's introduction, *Heinrichs von Langenstein "Unterscheidung der Geister" Lateinisch und Deutsch* (Munich: Artemis Verlag, 1977), p. 44.

[5] Henry of Langenstein, *De discretione spirituum* c. 4, in *Heinrichs von Langenstein*, p. 80; cf. Gerson, *De probatione* c. 8, in *Oeuvres*, 9:181, trans. Paschal Boland, *The Concept of "Discretio spirituum" in John Gerson's "De probatione spirituum" and "De distinctione verarum visionum a falsis"* (Washington,

D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1959), pp. 31–32; Gerson, *De examinatione doctrinarum* c. 5, in *Oeuvres*, 9:471; idem, *De passionibus animae* c. 14, in *Oeuvres*, 9:13.

[6] Frances Oakley, however, argues that d'Ailly's *On False Prophets* is now understood to have been written between 1410 and 1414 rather than between 1372 and 1395 ("Gerson and d'Ailly: An Admonition," *Speculum* 40 [1965]: 74–75, 78–79). See n. 20, below.

[7] This corresponds to Gerson's other efforts toward female containment, particularly the promotion of the cult of Saint Joseph. But the situation is hardly clear-cut. Gerson arguably played a pro-woman role through his writings that fostered his sisters' spirituality and in the position he assumed in the controversy over *The Romance of the Rose*. See Dyan Elliott, "Seeing Double: Jean Gerson, the Discernment of Spirits, and Joan of Arc," *American Historical Review* 107 (2002): 31–32; Barbara Newman, *God and the Goddesses: Vision, Poetry, and Belief in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), pp. 284–88.

[8] See Jo Ann McNamara, "The Rhetoric of Orthodoxy: Clerical Authority and Female Innovation in the Struggle with Heresy," in *Maps of Flesh and Light: The Religious Experience of Medieval Women Mystics*, ed. Ulrike Wiethaus (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1993), pp. 24–27; AndréVauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*, trans. Jean Birrell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 408–9. For general background on Gerson, see James Connolly, *Jean Gerson: Reformer and Mystic* (Louvain: Librairie Universitaire, 1928). Also see Pale è mon Glorieux, "La vie et les oeuvres de Gerson: essai chronologique," in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et litt è raire du Moyen Age* 25–26 (1950–51): 149–92. Cf. Wendy Love's discussion of Gerson in "Free Spirits, Presumptuous Women, and False Prophets: The Discernment of Spirits in the Late Middle Ages" (Ph.D. diss., Divinity School, University of Chicago, 2002), pp. 239–99. Note that Gerson's mystical apprehension was not restricted to women, however. See his two letters against the Flemish mystic John Ruusbroec (d. 1381), in *Oeuvres*, 2:55–62, 2:97–104; trans. Brian McGuire, *Jean Gerson: Early Works* (New York: Paulist Press, 1998), pp. 202–10, 249–55. For an exhaustive analysis, see AndréCombes, *Essai sur la critique de Ruysbroeck par Gerson*, 2 vols. (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1945–48), particularly the discussion of demonic inspiration, which conveniently mixes the true with the false (2:337–39). Gerson associates Ruusbroec's error with the mystical heresy of the Free Spirit, hence covertly implicating female mystical impulses (*Oeuvres*, 2:60; trans. McGuire, p. 208). See Robert Lerner's "The Image of Mixed Liquid in Late Medieval Mystical Thought," *Church History* 40 (1971): 407–9.

[9] See AndréVauchez's "Les pouvoirs informels dans l'Eglise aux derniers sie`cles du Moyen Age: visionnaires, prophe`tes et mystiques," *MEFRM* 96 (1984): 281–93; idem, "Sainte Brigitte de Sue`de et Sainte Catherine de Sienne: le mystique et l'Eglise aux derniers sie`cles du Moyen Age," in *Temi e problemi nella mistica femminile Trecento*, 14–17 ottobre Convegni del Centro di studi sulla spiritualita` medievale, Universita` degli studi di Perugia (Todi: Presso l'accademia Tudertina, 1983), pp. 229–48; idem, *The Laity in the Middle Ages: Religious Beliefs and Devotional Practices*, trans. Margery Schneider (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993), pp. 219–36. Also see Wendy Love's discussion of prophecy during the schism, "Free Spirits, Presumptuous Women," pp. 161–92.

[10] See *Magnum oecumenicum Constantiense Concilium*, ed. Hermann von der Hardt (Frankfurt and Leipzig: Christianus Genschius, 1698), vol. 3, fols. 28–38.

Henry of Langenstein's objections to Bridget's canonization, which appear in his *Consilium pacis de unione ecclesiae* of 1381, are likewise included in the materials for Constance. His basic objection was that the calendar of saints was fast becoming overpopulated (*Magnum . . . Constantiense* c. 18, vol. 2, fol. 56). On critics during Bridget's lifetime and after her death, see Claire Sahlin, *Birgitta of Sweden and the Voice of Prophecy* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 2001), pp. 136–68. Eric Colledge's now classic article focuses on Bridget's posthumous critics and her confessor's defense ("*Epistola solitarii ad reges*: Alphonse of Pecha as Organizer of Birgittine and Urbanist Propaganda," *Mediaeval Studies* 18 [1956]: 19–49). Bridget's canonization, originally proclaimed in 1391, was nevertheless confirmed by the council (*Magnum . . . Constantiense*, vol. 4, fols. 39–40). For Gerson's writings on discernment in the wider context of his views on church hierarchy and discipline, see B. J. Caiger, "Doctrine and Discipline in the Church of Jean Gerson," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 41 (1990): 389–407.

11 Gerson, *De distinctione verarum revelationum a falsis*, in *Oeuvres*, 3:42–43; trans. McGuire, pp. 343–44.

12 Gerson, *De distinctione*, in *Oeuvres*, 3:51; trans. McGuire, p. 356.

13 Gerson, *De distinctione*, in *Oeuvres*, 3:51; trans. McGuire, p. 356. On Gerson's invectives against the Free Spirit movement, for which Marguerite was construed by orthodoxy as a kind of spokesperson, see Robert Lerner's *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 164–77.

14 Gerson, *De probatione*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:180, 184 (bis); trans. Boland, pp. 30, 36, 36–37; cf.idem, *De examinatione* c. 6, in *Oeuvres*, 9:473. For general condemnations of curiosity and religious decadence that do not identify women particularly, see the following, all in *Oeuvres*: *De meditatione cordis*, 8:78; *De directione cordis* c. 27, c. 43, 8:105, 111; *Traite é des diverses tentations de l'ennemi*, 7,2:352; *De signis bonis et malis*, 9:164. Also see his own concern lest he be thought to be promoting the kind of singularity and curiosity he condemns, in *De theologia mystica* c. 4, 3:250, trans. McGuire, p. 263. In a passage discussed below, he refuses to pander to the curious, despite the excellent material at his disposal; cf. his commendation of Joan of Arc, p. 288, below. Note Albert the Great's characterization of women's desire for novelty, in chap. 5, p. 207, above.

15 Gerson, *De examinatione*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:463.

16 Gerson, *De examinatione*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:467–68.

17 Gerson, *De examinatione*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:467–68. Cf. Newman's assessment of Gerson's presentation of the Virgin as a model of discernment, in *God and the Goddesses*, pp. 288–90.

18 Gerson occasionally offers an ungendered discussion of discernment. See, for example, *De passionibus animae*, written in either 1409 or 1408, in *Oeuvres*, 9:15; *De signis bonis et malis*, 9:162–66.

19 Henry was one of the twenty-one theologians who condemned Marguerite's book, *The Mirror of Simple Souls*, in 1309. Moreover, he would be one of the six responsible for condemning the so-called heresy of the Free Spirit, which ostensibly drew its inspiration from Marguerite's book. For the process, see chap. 4, n. 208, above. Also see Lerner, *Heresy of the Free Spirit*, pp. 68–84.

20 If Oakley is correct in his assumption that Gerson's writings on discernment anticipated d'Ailly's *On False Prophets* and that it was Gerson who sparked his mentor's interest in such subjects, this would then mean that d'Ailly deliberately shied away from Gerson's *ad feminam* approach, opting for the

more neutral tradition. See n. 6, above. On Henry of Langenstein's use of Hildegard's prophecies, see Sylvain Gouguenheim, *La Sybille du Rhin: Hildegarde de Bingen, abbesse et proph è tesse rh è nane* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1996), chap. 7.

21 Gustav Sommerfeldt, ed., "Die Prophetien der hl. Hildegard von Bingen in einem Schreiben des Magisters Heinrich v. Langenstein (1383), und Langensteins Trostbrief über den Tod eines Bruders des Wormser Bischofs Eckard von Ders (um 1384)," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 30 (1909): 48. Henry does, however, utilize aspects of Hildegard's periodization that have a distinctly anti-woman stamp. From an eschatological standpoint, Hildegard is understood as saying that there were three periods from the time of Christ until 1100 (p. 48). The period immediately following 1100 was a "womanish age" for its superficiality and decadence (p. 54; cf. her similar influence in Peter d'Ailly's writings in the following note). I am indebted to Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski for bringing this letter to my attention. Henry was an early critic of Bridget's canonization. But this criticism was prompted by his objections to the several new canonizations being proposed (the other two were men). Basically he was concerned about the multiplication of saints as expressed by authorities like Hostiensis. See n. 10, above; and chap. 4, pp. 128–29, above.

22 Hildegard is particularly invoked for her prophetic anticipations of false prophets. See, for example, d'Ailly, *De falsis prophetis*, in *Joannis Gersonii opera omnia*, ed. L. Ellies du Pin (Ant-werp: Sumptibus societatis, 1706), tract 1, cols. 497, 500, 505; tract 2, col. 519. D'Ailly does, however, note that false prophets make considerable headway in the home of silly women or effeminate men ("frequentant domos muliercularum, aut virorum effeminatorum"), following the lead of 2 Tim. 3. He also cites a prophesy of Hildegard's that further predicts the appearance of certain false doctors who will lead women into error (cols. 496–97). For her prediction of the schism, see d'Ailly, *Tractatus de materia concilii generalis* (between 1402 and 1403), in *The Political Thought of Pierre d'Ailly: The Voluntarist Tradition*, ed. Francis Oakley (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964), app. 3, pp. 315–16. Hildegard shares the distinction of this particular prediction with her near contemporary Joachim of Fiore. See Laura Smoller, *History, Prophecy, and the Stars: The Christian Astrology of Pierre d'Ailly, 1350–1420* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994), pp. 96–97. According to Oakley, this treatise outlines a program of reform that would eventually be revised and presented at Constance as *Tractatus super reformatione ecclesiae*. Thus when AndréVauchez says, in partial exculpation of Gerson, that he is much less severe on current prophecy than his contemporaries Henry of Langenstein and Pierre d'Ailly, he is not taking gender into account ("Sainte Brigitte," p. 246). Vauchez plays the apologist for Gerson elsewhere as well, only this time John Nider is added to the mix—a comparison that implicitly acknowledges the gender problem since Nider's misogyny makes Gerson look tame (Vauchez, "Jeanne d'Arc et le prophétisme féminin des XIVe et XVe sie`cles," in *Jeanne d'Arc: une è poque, un rayonnement*, Colloque d'histoire médiéval, Orléans—Octobre 1979 [Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1982], p. 167).

23 D'Ailly, *De falsis prophetis* tract 1, col. 501.

24 See, for example, Gerson's *Pro unione ecclesiae*, written in 1391, in *Oeuvres*, 6:11–12, 14–15. By the time Gerson became chancellor in 1395, the university had become more actively involved in ending the schism. See John Morrall, *Gerson and the Great Schism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1960), pp. 58–59; Connolly, *Jean Gerson*, pp. 58–59, 169 ff.

25 Gerson, *De modo se habendi tempore schismatis*, in *Oeuvres*, 6:29–30. See

Alain Boureau's discussion of the anxiety surrounding the pseudo-pope in *The Myth of Pope Joan*, trans. Lydia Cochrane (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), pp. 147–49. The issue of perplexity was addressed in confessors' manuals as well. See, for example, Raymond of Peñafort, *Summa de poenitentia et matrimonio* 3.30.6–7 (Rome: Joannes Tallini, 1603), pp. 356–57.

[26] See Gerson's *C è dule de la commission*—a report either redacted or transmitted by Gerson, tentatively dated to 1411, in *Oeuvres*, 10:399–405 (in the supplement).

[27] See particularly Barbara Newman's "Divine Power Made Perfect in Weakness: St. Hildegard on the Frail Sex," in *Medieval Religious Women*, vol. 2, *Peaceweavers*, ed. John Nichols and Lillian Shank (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1987), pp. 103–22. Cf. Raymond of Capua's vita of Catherine of Siena in *AA SS*, April, 3:884, as cited by Caroline Walker Bynum, "Women's Stories, Women's Symbols: A Critique of Victor Turner's Theory of Liminality," in *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (New York: Zone Books, 1991), p. 39.

[28] See chap. 2, p. 78, above.

[29] On the papal schism and proliferation of prophecy, see Vauchez, "Les pouvoirs informels," p. 283.

[30] Noeïl Valois, ed., "Les révélations de Constance de Rabastens et le schisme d'occident (1384–86)" art. 26, *Annales du Midi* 8 (1896): 258–59. On Constance, see chap. 5, n. 157, above.

[31] See Colledge, "*Epistola solitarii*," pp. 31–33.

[32] Cf. Aquinas, *ST* 2a 2ae, q. 82, art. 3, resp. ad 3, 39:42–43; and Bonaventure, *Vitis mystica sive Tractactus de passione Domini: Additamentum IV* 24.81, in *S. Bonaventurae opera omnia*, ed. College of Saint Bonaventure (Florence: College of Saint Bonaventure, 1898), 8:201.

[33] Letter to Barthélemy Clantier, in *Oeuvres*, 2:61; trans. McGuire, pp. 208–9. (I have adapted McGuire's translation.) He goes on to argue, however, that experience of God is insufficient as a basis for assessment of the merits of mystical writings. In addition, one requires theological training. Also see his acknowledgment of women's special ability, in *De mystica theologia practica*, in *Oeuvres*, 8:22–23, trans. McGuire, p. 294; cf. *La Montaigne de contemplation*, in *Oeuvres*, 7,1:16, trans. McGuire, p. 75. Elsewhere, he relates reading about a woman whose veins were said to burst, expanding like newly fermenting wine without an outlet, when she heard a preacher speak of the soul's union with God (*De mystica theologia speculativa*, in *Oeuvres*, 3:286–87). Gerson was probably reading Thomas of Cantimpré's *De apibus* 2.49.2, pp. 442–43.

[34] Gerson's second letter against Ruusbroec, in *Oeuvres*, 2:98–99; trans. McGuire, p. 251. Gerson does, however, grant that the clerics are also to blame for this situation. See *De mystica theologia practica*, in *Oeuvres*, 8:41; trans. McGuire, p. 323.

[35] See Palémon Glorieux, "Le Chancelier Gerson et la réforme de l'enseignement," in *M è langes offerts a` Etienne Gilson* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1959), pp. 285–98; Steven Ozment, "The University and the Church: Patterns of Reform in Jean Gerson," *Mediaevalia et Humanistica*, n.s., 1 (1970): 112–16; idem, *Homo Spiritualis: A Comparative Study of the Anthropology of Johannes Tauler, Jean Gerson, and Martin Luther in the Context of Their Theological Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 1969), pp. 49–54; and Connolly, *John Gerson*, pp. 207–10.

[36] See Gerson's *De theologia mystica lectiones sex*, in *Oeuvres*, 3:250–92. Excerpts from this treatise are translated by McGuire in *Jean Gerson*, pp. 262–87, and in Ozment, *Jean Gerson: Selections from "A Deo exivit," "Contra*

curiositatem studentium," and "De mystica theologia speculativa", Textus minores, 38 (Leiden: Brill, 1969), pp. 46–73.

[37] See particularly Gerson's *De meditatione cordis*, in *Oeuvres*, 8:77–84, esp. p. 83, and *De simplificatione cordis*, in *Oeuvres*, 8:85–99, esp. p. 94. Both of these treatises were written at Constance in July 1417. By discrediting image-dependent revelations, Gerson was adhering to the traditional Augustinian hierarchy of vision. See chap. 5, n. 95, above.

[38] *De meditatione cordis* c. 18, in *Oeuvres*, 8:83.

[39] Gerson appeals to Bonaventure for this solution in *De examinatione*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:464. (Bonaventure does, however, excuse the mistaking of a consecrated host for an unconsecrated one.) Gerson had made the same point earlier in *Regulae mandatorum* (between 1400 and 1415), where he says explicitly that invincible ignorance was no excuse since the person should first have proven the spirit (c. 47, in *Oeuvres*, 9:106).

[40] Gerson, *De centilogium de impulsibus*, in *Oeuvres*, 8:141–43.

[41] On this pattern, see Maryanne Kowaleski and Judith Bennett, "Crafts, Gilds, and Women in the Middle Ages: Fifty Years after Marian K. Dale," in *Sisters and Workers in the Middle Ages*, ed. Judith Bennett et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), pp. 11–25.

[42] D. Catherine Brown thinks it unlikely that Gerson was himself a mystic (*Pastor and Laity in the Theology of Jean Gerson* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987], p. 205; cf. McGuire's introduction, *Jean Gerson*, p. 21).

[43] Gerson, *De theologia mystica lectiones sex*, in *Oeuvres*, 3:255; trans. McGuire, pp. 270–71.

[44] This point is made in the second letter against Ruusbroec, in *Oeuvres*, 2:102; trans. McGuire, p. 255. See Lerner, *Heresy of the Free Spirit*, p. 166.

[45] Michel Foucault, "Discourse on Language," appendix in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (London: Routledge, 1972), pp. 225, 220.

[46] Gerson, however, presents himself as a democratizing force for mysticism when he justifies writing the vernacular *Mountain of Contemplation*—a perspective taken at face value by many scholars (*Oeuvres*, 7,1:16; trans. McGuire, p. 75; Brown, *Pastor and Laity*, pp. 183–94; McGuire, *Jean Gerson*, introd., p. 24; Connolly, *Jean Gerson*, pp. 259–60). But, as Gerson was only too well aware, mysticism did not need democratizing and such works could instead be construed as efforts at control. *The Mountain*, for instance, only briefly (and elliptically) treats rapture, unlike his Latin works. See, for example, *De theologia mystica lectiones sex*, in *Oeuvres*, 3:282–83; trans. McGuire, pp. 282–84. Gerson wrote *The Mountain* for his sisters, who were living a Beguine lifestyle. Cf. his letter of 1399–1400 outlining daily devotions, in *Oeuvres*, 2:14–17; trans. McGuire, pp. 156–60. See Brian McGuire, "Late Medieval Care and the Control of Women: Jean Gerson and His Sisters," *Revue d'histoire eccl è siastique* 92 (1997): 5–36.

[47] Gerson, *De centilogium de impulsibus* no. 56, in *Oeuvres*, 8:142. See Ruth Karras, *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), pp. 90–93. This tenor of violence persists today. See George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's discussion of argument as war in *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), pp. 4–5.

[48] See Colledge, "*Epistola solitarii*," p. 45. Arne Joïnsson has edited Alphonse's treatise in *Alfonso of Ja è n: His Life and Works* (Lund: Lund University Press, 1989), pp. 115–67. Rosalynn Voaden draws on Alan of Lille to describe Gerson's appropriation as having " 'a wax nose, which means it can be

bent to take on new meanings' " (*God's Words, Women's Voices: The Discernment of Spirits in the Writing of Late-Medieval Women Visionaries* [Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 1999], p. 42). On the collaborative work between Bridget and Alphonse, see Hans Gilkær, *The Political Ideas of St. Birgitta and Her Spanish Confessor, Alfonso Pecha*, trans. Michael Cain, Odense University Studies in History and Social Sciences, vol. 163 (Odense: Odense University Press, 1993).

[49] Gerson, *De mystica theologia practica* c. 8, c. 2, in *Oeuvres*, 8:33, 22–23; trans. McGuire, pp. 312, 294. Gerson also designates Gregory the Great and Bernard of Clairvaux as concupiscible, Jerome as irascible, and Augustine and Thomas Aquinas as rational. Elsewhere, he will associate the irascible with the majesty of God, the rational with the Son, and the concupiscible with the goodness of the Spirit (see *De theologia mystica lectiones sex*, consideratio 42, in *Oeuvres*, 3:288; trans. Ozment, *Jean Gerson*, p. 61). Aquinas speaks of only two powers of the soul (the irascible and concupiscible—divisions of the sense of appetite), which are controlled by reason (*ST* 1a, q. 81, art. 2, 11:206–11). Gerson's division is closer to Thomas of Cantimpré's (see *Liber de natura rerum* 2.9, ed. H. Boese [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1973], 1:89).

[50] Gerson is especially indebted toWilliam of Auvergne. See, for example, the list of delusions, including the man who thought he was a rooster, in *De passionibus animae* c. 20, in *Oeuvres*, 9:19–20; *De distinctione* c. 51, in *Oeuvres*, 3:44, trans. McGuire, pp. 89–90; *Regulae mandatorum*, 9:119; *Traite é des diverses tentations de l'ennemi*, 7,2:346–48. Cf. *Contra superstitiosam dierum observantium*, where he describes superstitious practices as arising from a melancholic imagination, inner lesions of the brain, or a debility of the imaginative power. One of his proofs for this last point is that old women, children, and half-wits are more inclined to believe these things (*Oeuvres*, 9:119–20); *De meditatione cordis* c. 7, c. 18, in *Oeuvres*, 8:79, 83–84).

[51] On the relation between lay inferiority and illiteracy in this period, see Yves Congar, "Clerus et lai ö au point de vue de la culture au Moyen Age: 'laicus' = sans lettres," in *Studia mediaevalia et mariologica P. Carolo Balic OFM septuagesimum explenti annum dictata* (Rome: Antonianum, 1971), 309–32. He makes the telling point that there is no word for a female cleric by referring to a female biographer who styles herself a good *clericus* (p. 318).

[52] For notable attacks on and defenses of women, see Alcuin Blamires, ed., *Woman Defamed and Woman Defended: An Anthology of Medieval Texts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992). Cf. his analysis of the pro-woman texts in *The Case for Women in Medieval Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997).

[53] Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990), p. 31. Although Butler's idea of the bad copy is primarily mobilized to characterize the perception of gay sexuality in relation to heterosexuality, it is clearly useful for understanding medieval notions of gender. For an overview of the medical construction of woman's secondary nature, see Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: The Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), esp. pt. 1.

[54] See Gerson, *Oeuvres*, 2:93–96; trans. McGuire, pp. 244–49. Ermine's life and visions, recorded by her confessor, the Franciscan John Le Graveur, have recently been edited by Claude Arnaud-Gillet as *Entre Dieu et Satan: les visions d'Ermine de Reims (*] *1396)* (Florence: Sismel, Edizione del Galluzzo, 1997). Morel was acting on behalf of Ermine's confessor (ibid., introd., pp. 16–17). Glorieux had tentatively dated Gerson's letter as 1408. Arnaud-Gillet more convincingly places Gerson's initial assessment of Ermine in 1401 or 1402 (ibid., introd., pp. 21–24). This makes sense in the context of Gerson's own statement, cited below, that his judgment on Ermine coincided with his treatise

On Distinguishing True from False Revelations, which was written in 1401.

55 See Fran ç oise Bonney's comparison of Gerson's two interventions in "Jugement de Gerson sur deux expériences de la vie mystique de son époque: les visions d'Ermine et de Jeanne d'Arc," in *Actes du 95e congre`s national des Soci è t è s Savantes, Reims 1970* (Paris: Biblioth[egrave]que Nationale, 1974), 2:187–95. The treatment is somewhat flawed by the implicit assumption that Gerson had the same familiarity with Joan's visions as did the inquisitors at her trial (pp. 192–93). But see her characterization of Ermine's visions (pp. 190–92).

56 Gerson, *Oeuvres*, 2:94; trans. McGuire, p. 245.

57 Gerson, *Oeuvres*, 2:95; trans. McGuire, p. 247.

58 Gerson, *Oeuvres*, 2:96; trans. McGuire, p. 248.

59 Gerson, *Oeuvres*, 2:96; trans. McGuire, pp. 248–49.

60 Gerson, *De examinatione*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:474. Arnaud-Gillet notes that by the time of Gerson's reversal, all of Ermine's supporters were safely dead (*Entre Dieu et Satan*, introd., pp. 26–27).

61 In addition to his allusion to Marguerite Porete's confusion of carnal and spiritual love alluded to above, this treatise also contains what was first identified by Huizinga as an autobiographical episode concerning a spiritual friendship with a woman that slowly reverted to its carnal counterpart (*De distinctione*, in *Oeuvres*, 3:52; trans. McGuire, p. 357). See Brian McGuire, "Jean Gerson and the End of Spiritual Friendship: Dilemmas of Conscience," in *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Julian Haseldine (Thrupp, UK: Sutton Publishing, 1999), pp. 236–38.

62 Gerson, *De distinctione*, in *Oeuvres*, 3:39; trans. McGuire, p. 337.

63 *De distinctione*, in *Oeuvres*, 3:39; trans. McGuire, p. 339. Cf. *De probatione*, 9:182; trans. Boland, p. 33.

64 Ambrose, *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* 1.1, ed. M. Adriaen, *CCSL*, 14 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1957), pp. 6–7; John Cassian, *Conf è rences* 1.20–22, ed. and trans. E. Pichery, *SC*, 42 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1955), 1:101–5; trans. Boniface Ramsey, *Conferences* (New York: Paulist Press, 1997), pp. 59–63; Jerome, *Commentar. in Epist. ad Ephes.* 3.4, v. 31 ad *Omnis amaritudo, et furor, et ira*, *PL* 26, col. 549; Jerome, *Comment. in Epist. ad Philemonem* v. 4 ff., ad *Gratias ago Deo me semper*, *PL* 26, col. 646. Cf. Gregory the Great's detailed deployment of this theme with respect to the question of false prophets when he comments on the qualities of Leviathan in Job 41.10 (*Moralia in Iob* 33.35.60, ed. Mark Adriaen, *CCSL* 143b [Turnhout: Brepols, 1985], pp. 1724–26). Jerome increases the authority of this image when he claims that Christ himself ordered his followers to be good money changers (Ep. 119, To Minervius and Alexander, *Epistulae*, ed. I. Hilberg, *CSEL* 55, rev. and supplemented ed. [Vienna: Verlag der oïsterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996], pp. 467–68). Alardus Gazaeus identifies this passage as the Gospel according to the Hebrews —an apocryphal work that still would have been fair game at the time of Origen and earlier commentators on this theme but Jerome knows better. See Gazaeus's commentary on Cassian's *Collationes* 1.20, *PL* 49, col. 511, note d. On God "proving" his saints, see chap. 3, pp. 106–9, above. On discernment generally, Joseph Lienhard, "On 'Discernment of Spirits' in the Early Church," *Theological Studies* 41 (1980): 505–29; Gustave Bardy, "Discernement des esprits: II. Chez les pe`res," *DS*, vol. 3, cols. 1251–52.

65 See Jacques Derrida's *Given Time: 1. Counterfeit Money*, trans. Peggy Kamuf (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 157–58. Derrida emphasizes that whatever interest accrues still has a disturbing origin "from a simulacrum, from a copy of a copy (*phantasma*)" (p. 161). Thanks to Simon

Gaunt for bringing this work to my attention. Note that Cassian's spiritual counterfeit coin is identical in every way to the legitimate species—save that it was unlawfully minted (*Conf è rences* 1.20, 1.21, pp. 104, 105; trans. Ramsey, pp. 61, 62). Cf. the heretical Lollard counter-feiters described in Paul Strohm's *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), pp. 128–29.

66 Gerson, *De distinctione*, in *Oeuvres*, 3:39; trans. McGuire, p. 338.

67 Gerson, *De probatione*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:179; trans. Boland, pp. 28–29.

68 Gerson, *De probatione*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:178; trans. Boland, p. 28.

69 "Tu quis, quid, quare / cui, qualiter, unde require," Gerson, *De probatione*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:180; trans. Boland, p. 30.

70 See chap. 1, pp. 23–25, above. Also see Brian McGuire, "Education, Confession, and Pious Fraud: Jean Gerson and a Late Medieval Change," *American Benedictine Review* 47 (1996): 330–33.

71 Gerson, *De probatione*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:181; trans. Boland, p. 32.

72 Gerson, *De examinatione*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:469.

73 Gerson, *De examinatione*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:471–72. Cf. Gerson's similar recognition of just how controversial his suggestions for doctrinal monitoring are in his earlier work *On the Curiosity of Students* (chap. 6, p. 248, above). See Ozment, "The University and the Church," p. 112, and Caiger, who observes that, despite Gerson's growing disillusionment about the church as an institution, this later treatise exemplifies his later tendency to make doctrine "the handmaid of discipline" ("Doctrine and Discipline," p. 406).

74 Gerson, *De examinatione*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:469–70. On Bridget and Catherine's involvement in the schism, see Bridget Morris, *St. Birgitta of Sweden* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 1999), pp. 113–17; Karen Scott, " 'Io Catharina': Ecclesiastical Politics and Oral Culture in the Letters of Catherine of Siena," in *Dear Sister: Medieval Women and the Epistolatory Genre*, ed. Karen Cherewatuk and Ulrike Wiethaus (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), pp. 87–121; and n. 9, above.

75 For the intial controversy surrounding Joan, see Deborah Fraioli's *Joan of Arc: The Early Debate* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 2000). Joan's mission would, in fact, be helped by the contemporary climate of prophecy. See Jacques Paul, "Le prophétisme autour de Jeanne d'Arc et de sa mission," in *Il profetismo gioachimita tra Quattrocento e Cinquecento*, Atti del III Congresso Internazionale di Studi Gioachimiti, S. Giovanni in Fiore, 17–21 settembre 1989, ed. Gian Luca Potesta` (Geneva: Marietti, 1991), pp. 157–81; Vauchez, "Jeanne d'Arc et le prophétisme," pp. 163–66. In particular, Joan's coming was thought to have been predicted by the prophetess Marie Robine. See Noeïl Valois, "Jeanne d'Arc et la prophétie de Marie Robine," in *M è langes Paul Fabre: Etudes d'histoire du Moyen Age* (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1902), pp. 452–67. See Matthew Tobin, "Le 'Livre de révélations' de Marie Robine: étude et édition," *MEFRM* 98 (1986): 229–64. The question of Joan's awareness of these prophecies is raised at her trial. See Pierre Tisset, ed., *Proce`s de condamnation de Jeanne d'Arc* (Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1960), 1:67. Also note the important role played by the popular apocalyptic preacher Brother Richard, whose impact is described in the journal of an anonymous Parisian. See *A Parisian Journal: 1405–1449* ann. 1429, trans. Janet Shirley (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), pp. 230–35. Joan met with Brother Richard once; he performed an ad hoc exorcism before approaching but would eventually validate her mission. Joan is also questioned about her dealings with him at her trial (Tisset, *Proce`s*, 1:98; cf. 261, 100, 105, 206). See Jules de La Martini[egrave]re, "Fr[egrave]re Richard et Jeanne d'Arc a` Orléans: mars–juillet 1430," *Le Moyen Age*, ser. 3, 5 (1934): 189–98.

[76] For Joan's visions and the discernment of spirits, see William Christian, who uses Joan as something of a test case for later Christian visionaries, in *Apparitions in Late Medieval Spain* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1981), pp. 188–94. Karen Sullivan posits that Joan did attempt something like Gersonian discernment on her own revelations (*The Interrogations of Joan of Arc* [Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999], pp. 33–35). Gerson's exile was prompted by his condemnation of the murder of the duke of Orleans by the Burgundians (see Connolly, *John Gerson*, pp. 164–67, 189–91).

[77] Gerson, *De puella Aurelianensi* (also known as *De mirabili victoria*), in *Oeuvres*, 9:661–62. This treatise has been partially translated by H. G. Francq, "Jean Gerson's Theological Treatise and Other Memoirs in Defence of Joan of Arc," *Revue de l'Universite é d'Ottawa* 41 (1971): 61–64. See Fraioli's summary in *Joan of Arc*, pp. 22–44. She remains, however, circumspect as to its authorship.

[78] X.5.7.1. Cf. the epigraph in chap. 5, p. 212, above.

[79] Cf. his similar view if someone inadvertently supports the wrong side in the schism, n. 25, above.

[80] Gerson, *De puella Aurelianensi*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:662.

[81] See chap. 4, p. 127 ff., above. Cf. Georges Peyronnet, "Gerson, Charles VII et Jeanne d'Arc: la propagande au service de la guerre," *Revue d'histoire eccl è siastique* 84, 1 (1989): 344.

[82] Gerson, *De puella Aurelianensi*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:663. The *Distichs* was an anonymous collection of witty sayings, written sometime in the third century but attributed to Cato the Elder, which was was wildly popular in university circles. The full epigraph is "When you live properly, don't worry about the words of evil men; / it is not necessary that we judge what everybody else says" (*Disticha Catonis* 3.2, ed. Marcus Boas [Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1952], p. 154).

[83] Gerson, *De puella Aurelianensi*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:663.

[84] Gerson, *De puella Aurelianensi*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:664.

[85] Gerson, *De puella Aurelianensi*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:665. Gerson does not take advantage of the cross-dressing female saints in the hagiographic tradition, even though one of Joan's voices, Margaret, had availed herself of this strategy to avoid marriage—at least in one of the versions of her tale cited in James of Voragine's popular *Golden Legend*. See Marie Delcourt, "Le complexe de Diane dans l'hagiographie chrétienne," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 143 (1958): 18–28; cf. Charles Wood, *Joan of Arc and Richard III: Sex, Saints, and Government in the Middle Ages* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 136–37.

[86] Gerson, *De puella Aurelianensi*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:665.

[87] *De bono et maligno spiritu* is edited and translated by Noeïl Valois, "Un nouveau témoignage sur Jeanne d'Arc: réponse d'un clerc parisien a` l'apologie de la pucelle par Gerson (1429)," *Annu- aire-Bulletin de la Soci è te é d'histoire de France* 43 (1906): 161–79. For dating, see p. 165. Also see Peyronnet's discussion in "Gerson, Charles VII et Jeanne d'Arc," pp. 358–59, and Fraioli's *Joan of Arc*, pp. 159–72.

[88] There is a record for 22 September 1429 that 8 sol. were paid for a copy of the treatise *De bono et malino spiritu* [sic]. See Denifle, no. 2370, 4:515. Others have also recognized the application of Gerson's method at Joan's trial. See Sullivan, *The Interrogations of Joan*, pp. 33–34; Christian, *Apparitions*, pp. 92–93.

[89] Gerson, *De puella Aurelianensi*, in *Oeuvres*, 9:662.

[90] *De bono*, p. 176. See X.1.1.1, X.1.4.9.

[91] *De bono*, p. 175. See X.5.7.12 (under the general rubric *De haereticis*). As

Valois notes, this canon figured prominently in Joan's process of condemnation ("Un nouveau témoignage," p. 175 n. 3). See the final deliberations of the doctors and masters of Rouen, in Tisset, *Proce`s*, 1:320.

92 *De bono*, p. 176. Out of the many canons cited supporting the contention against female cross-dressing, only the first is an explicit anathema on the practice from the Council of Gangra (ca. 340). See Dist. 30 c. 6. The association between the assumption of male dress and fornication is, interestingly, supported by Innocent III's condemnation of a Spanish abbess who was performing certain sacerdotal functions, such as hearing confession (X.5.38.10).

93 *De bono*, pp. 176–77.

94 *De bono*, pp. 177–78. Joan was repeatedly questioned about her raid on Paris, which occurred on the Virgin's Nativity, at her trial (Tisset, *Proce`s*, 1:53, 141, 267–68). For her part, Joan claimed that it was not a mortal sin, since she was confident that she would be aware if she had committed one (1:152). The anonymous Parisian also takes note of Joan's raid on the feast of Mary's Nativity (*A Parisian Journal* ann. 1429, p. 240). Her judges also attempted to prove that she received inappropriate reverence (Tisset, *Proce`s*, 1:100, 101).

95 *De bono*, p. 178. In support of his indictment, the anonymous critic cites X.2.20.52 (which treats of the necessity of carefully examining witnesses in processes of canonization) and the entire title for *De reliquiis et veneratione sanctorum* (X.3.45)—treating papal prerogative in canonization and forbidding a profligate display of relics. Joan denied that she had anything to do with the circulation of these images, but she did admit to having seen one in the hands of a Scotsman (Tisset, *Proce`s*, 1:98–99, 261).

96 *De bono*, p. 178. This is not the first time that the anonymous author tangles with Gerson directly. Earlier, he taunts Gerson for his use of Cato, arguing that if Gerson had read further, he would have been properly warned that one should be sparing in one's praises; he quotes the first line of this anonymous couplet: "Praise sparingly, for he whom you would often test [*probaris*]; / one day will reveal whether he is a friend." It is appropriate, moreover, that in his citation, the anonymous author uses a version that enlists the word *probare* (prove) over the more usual *laudare* (praise) (*De bono*, p. 176; see *Disticha* 4.28, p. 228; and p. 229 for this less common version).

97 *De bono*, pp. 178–79. In support of bringing in an inquisitor, he cites VI.5.2.8, no. 4. The charge that Joan dripped wax on the children's heads in order to tell their fortunes also crops up at her trial (Tisset, *Proce`s*, 1:271).

98 *De bono*, p. 179. The completion of the sentence, which the author does not cite, is "when the disease has gained strength by long delay" (Ovid, *The Remedies for Love* l. 92, in *Ovid: The Art of Love and Other Poems*, trans. J. H. Mozley, 2d ed., Loeb Classical Library, Ovid, II [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979], p. 185).

99 *De bono*, p. 179. Gratian is invoking Jerome (C.24 q.3 c.16).

100 In addition to *De puella Aurelianensi* (or *De mirabili victoria*), there is yet another treatise that is frequently linked with Gerson's name, called *De quadam puella*. Among scholars who believe that Gerson wrote a defense, some prefer *De quadam* as his authentic work—at least partially owing to its greater ebullience. Still others posit that Gerson wrote both. See Peyronnet's discussion of the two treatises in "Gerson, Charles VII and Jeanne d'Arc," pp. 339–47. He is more inclined to credit the authenticity of *De puella Aurelianensi*.

101 See, for example, MarinaWarner's skepticism in *Joan of Arc: The Image of Female Heroism* (London: George Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1981), p. 146.

102 Dorothy Wayman, "The Chancellor and Jeanne d'Arc, February–July, A.D. 1429," *Franciscan Studies* 18 (1957): 273–305. The treatises are appended

to her article. Francq, who believes that both treatises were composed by Gerson, translates *De quadam puella* in "Jean Gerson's Theological Treatise," pp. 74–89. For critiques of Wayman's theory, see Peyronnet, "Gerson, Charles VII et Jeanne d'Arc," pp. 347–48; Francq, "Jean Gerson's Theological Treatise," pp. 70–72. Deborah Fraioli, however, finds Wayman's theory persuasive. See "The Literary Image of Joan of Arc: Prior Influences," *Speculum* 56 (1981): 813–14.

103 Wayman, "The Chancellor and Jeanne," p. 282.

104 See Valois's introduction to *De bono*, in "Un nouveau témoignage," pp. 162 ff. Note that Gerson's treatise was also appropriated for other purposes. Gertrude Merkle argues that Martin Le Franc used it in the section on Joan in his *Champion des dames* (ca. 1440). See "Martin Le Franc's Commentary on Jean Gerson's Treatise on Joan of Arc," in *Fresh Verdicts on Joan of Arc*, ed. Bonnie Wheeler and Charles Wood (New York: Garland, 1996), pp. 177–88.

105 The anonymous summary is edited by Jules Quicherat in *Proce`s de condamnation et de r è habilitation de Jeanne d'Arc* (Paris: Renouard, 1847), 4:260. Gerson's treatise is reissued on 3:298–306.

106 Much of our information about the false Joan comes from the journal of the anonymous Parisian, which reports on how she was brought to trial by the university and the parlement, though we do not learn of the outcome (*A Parisian Journal* ann. 1440, pp. 337–38). The documents on the false Joan have been gathered in Quicherat, *Proce`s de condamnation*, 5:321–36. According to Pierre Sala, writing in the early sixteenth century, the false Joan eventually achieved an audience with Charles VII, in the course of which she broke into tears and confessed her ruse (4:281). For further discussion, see A. Lecoy de la Marche, "Une fausse Jeanne d'Arc," *Revue des questions historiques* 10 (1871): 562–82; Vauchez, "Jeanne d'Arc et le prophétisme," pp. 166–67; idem, *The Laity*, pp. 262–63. Also see Boureau's discussion of the possibility of a good and an evil Joan of Arc in *The Myth of Pope Joan*, pp. 177 ff.

107 For a discussion of this concept, see Lacanian interpreter, Slavoj Žižžek, *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan through Popular Culture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991), pp. 29–47; idem, *Enjoy Your Symptom! Jacques Lacan in Hollywood and Out* (New York: Routledge, 1992), pp. 20–22. Note the extent to which the horrifying "double" is accommodated within this discourse.

108 John Nider, *Formicarium* 5.8 (Douai: B. Belleri, 1602), p. 383.

109 Ibid., p. 386. This rarefied form of discernment seems to be a relatively common claim among holy women. See, for example, *De apibus* 1.1.4, p. 5–6. On the attribution of parallel abilities to Joan, see chap. 6, pp. 255–56, above.

110 Nider, *Formicarium* 5.8, p. 387. For Nider's similar refusal to pass sentence on female spirituality, also with deleterious consequences, see Dyan Elliott, "The Physiology of Rapture and Female Spirituality," in *Medieval Theology and the Natural Body*, ed. Peter Biller and Alastair Minnis (Woodbridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell and Brewer, 1997), pp. 170–72. Nider probably did not know Gerson's treatise, but he seems

to have been familiar with the anonymous *On the Good and Evil Spirit* (see Denifle, no. 2370, 4:515).

Conclusion

> But what of certain old women who say they see souls in purgatory while in rapture and many other things . . .whose feet do not feel fire? Let it be stated that the devil directs fantasies into their imagination to such a degree that they feel nothing on the outside.
>
> (Bernard Basin, *On the Magic Arts*, ca. 1483)[1]
>
> And Jesus wept.
>
> (John 11.35)

OVER THE COURSE of the High and later Middle Ages, society had been forced to contend with any number of intense social and cultural upheavals. Amid these tides of change, it was within the concept of proof that the clerical intelligentsia sought safe harbor. Proof and its attendant methods came to represent security and stability to the church militant. Ultimately, the mechanisms of proof were perceived as the most respectful and necessary procedures for discerning the pronouncements of the church triumphant and establishing God's will on earth. Latin Christendom's preoccupation with proof expressed itself through an ever expanding number of ingenious intellectual maneuvers and practical protocols. Among the church's more prominent initiatives were efforts to refine the sacramental system in order to prove doctrinal tenets against heterodox opponents; the development of scholasticism to buttress the faith; and the cultivation of the inquisitional process—at first to discipline the clergy, but very soon to reify and police the boundaries of orthodoxy through the appropriate designation of sanctity and heresy.

The different agencies responsible for generating these proofs—be they theological circles, the university hierarchy, ecclesiastical tribunals, or the papal curia—were all patriarchal in nature. As a matter of course, women were excluded from their deliberations. Yet while denied the official role of purveyors and assessors of evidence, women nevertheless found themselves implicated in the clergy's machinery of proof for a time as living exempla of orthodox contentions. Such was the case in the early thirteenth century when holy women were singled out as uniquely suited for "proving" the newly established sacramental system, one that particularly highlighted auricular confession and the eucharist. And yet women were not being required to shoulder a thankless burden: the potential rewards for women willing to serve in this propagandistic capacity were great. The confessional relationship, in particular, a milieu conducive to the fostering and possible publication of the women's mystical experiences, opened up a new world of spiritual fulfillment.

This relationship could afford women unprecedented intimacy with and respect from the priesthood (whose members had also benefited from a sharp increase in symbolic power through the sacramental system, making their attentions all the more meaningful), the possibility of public adulation, considerable impact on the local community, and occasionally even a direct influence upon public life. And yet from the outset the path designated for these manifest embodiments of proof was strewn with substantial risks. On the most fundamental basis, there were profound threats to a woman's physical well-being. The Beguine mystic was portrayed by her clerical sponsors as a kind of living martyr, someone who, by virtue of her ongoing physical suffering, was already dead to the world—a stance intended to offset the stirring examples of the many heretics who were prepared to be martyred for their faith. Among the most dramatic illustrations of the mystic's new interstitial role were the many somatic proofs that came to be closely identified with female spirituality. Yet however rich the symbolic meaning of these proofs, there is no question that they were often physically debilitating, even life-threatening, to the women in question. By the end of the Middle Ages, the wretched condition of the female body was among the most prominent features of female sanctity. It is difficult not to pronounce against a religious culture that made this kind of suffering one of the tacit conditions for celebrating the spiritual achievement of women.

But the danger of miraculous somatism was only one of the perils to which pious women might be subjected. The concurrent rise of the sacrament of confession and the prominence of confession in disparate inquisitional tribunals were not discrete phenomena. The relationship between Elisabeth of Hungary and her confessor, inquisitor Conrad of Marburg, is a telling enactment of some of the ways in which the sacramental and inquisitorial fora could invade one another, at least on a disciplinary level: the severity of Elisabeth's pentitential practices contributed to her premature death, an occurrence inseparable from her subordination to Conrad. But parallel relations between priestly inquisitors and female penitents, though rarely a match for Conrad's unabashedly brutal treatment of Elisabeth, were sometimes invested with still more dire implications. As the Fournier register reveals, Auda was denounced for what was essentially a private religious crisis by her overscrupulous friend Ermengardis. In the course of Auda's subsequent relationship with the pastorally oriented inquisitor Bishop Fournier, not only did she confirm this denunciation; she was further induced to denounce the several friends who were attempting to protect Auda from her own self-destructive scrupulosity.

If it is difficult to separate the proofs implicit in female spirituality from a set of behaviors that were in many ways harmful to the women

in question, it is equally difficult to overlook the potentially pernicious effect of the propagandistic use of holy women's lives. For writers like James of Vitry and Thomas of Cantimpré, female mysticism and suffering alike were enlisted to counteract heretical skepticism by supporting the nascent theology of purgatory. Not only did heretics balk at the existence of purgatory, but many resisted the prerogatives of divine judgment altogether, instead positing salvation for all. Women's visions of beleaguered souls in purgatory and the vicarious suffering the women endured on behalf of these souls were powerful refutations of heretical opposition. But one clear effect of such female interventions was to endorse not only the system of divine justice but also its all too human correlatives operating in various terrestrial tribunals. The mere existence of purgatorial suffering emphasized the utility of its mundane counterpart. This gradual purification of earthly suffering could be used to vindicate the most severe disciplinary measures of ecclesiastical and secular tribunals, paving the way for a still more autocratic and coercive church and state.

The deployment of women's confessional and penitential practices was one of orthodoxy's most subtle but, arguably, most powerful campaigns against heresy. A more insistent and programmatic initiative entailed the application of the inquisitional process—most strikingly to stigmatize instances of heresy, but also to distinguish cases of sanctity. This procedure had an inexorable momentum toward criminalization: in certain celebrated instances, as with the cases of Armannus Punzilupus and Guglielma of Milan, processes that had been undertaken in order to canonize a saint concluded with the condemnation of a heretic. By the same token, the implacable procedures devised to stigmatize heretics often had the opposite effect, as when an outraged population created "martyrs" from the inquisition's alleged heretics—a predicament so poignantly demonstrated among the Beguins of southern France. The reversals inherent in inquisitional procedure correspond to a similar propensity in the related field of scholasticism: both formal proofs of the faith and arguments supporting the divine origin of a particular mystic's revelations were subject to quick overturnings and destabilization.

As the threat of heresy gradually receded, the climate hitherto favoring female spirituality likewise began to change. An important index to this change is the way in which the spirituality of living women was progressively subjected to the rigors of the *inquisitio*. Such processes were increasingly informed by a quasimedicalized discourse that tended to disparage women and pathologize some of the most characteristic aspects of their spirituality, particularly the ill-health associated with divinely inspired somatism or scrupulosity in confession. It is certainly significant that when a clerical discourse on

spiritual discernment eventually arose, it entirely discounted the proof of somatic changes as evidence of grace. Such antiquated arguments would become the domain of lay magnates like Ercole d'Este, whose vehement efforts to defend his holy stigmatic, Lucia of Narni, also convey the shock of recognition that he had overinvested in a stock that was on the decline. Furthermore, with the rise of the discourse on spiritual discernment, the various factors gradually undermining female spirituality were brought into sharp focus. John Gerson, whose own spiritual aspirations on behalf of the university fueled his antagonism toward female spirituality, exemplifies this trend. Gerson had argued that the inquisitional procedure should not be reserved for heretics and dead saints but should be brought to bear on contemporary female mystics. The sheer weight of Gerson's authority, in conjunction with the incisiveness and prolixity of his writings on discernment, set a formidable disciplinary mechanism in motion. As Gerson was himself to learn, once mobilized, its momentum was unstoppable.

Many of the chilling trends isolated in this study are further illuminated in a revealing interpolation that occurs in a number of manuscripts of Gerson's treatise *On the Examination of Doctrine*, supplanting the usual conclusion. Under the rubric "the example of the seduction [practiced] by a certain woman in 1424," a trial, the proceedings of which had allegedly been read before the clergy at Lyons, is recounted. A female mystic, who "under the cover of devotion and revelations feigned marvels," was arrested in the French city of Bourg-en-Bresse. The woman claimed that she was one of five women sent to redeem souls from hell (we can only speculate about the identities of the other four). Around three souls per day were released through her efforts—two quite easily, the third with great difficulty and pain. Apparently, she alleged the presence of hot coals at her feet that would afflict her whenever a soul was sentenced to hell. The woman was further possessed of the ability to see the sins of individuals simply by gazing at their foreheads—an effect that Augustine notes could be wrought by the devil, as the author of this report hastens to add. Her numerous ecstasies were replete with many marvelous revelations. Moreover, she had already established a large following among the "simple little women" of the area. Finding this situation unacceptable, "the nourishing spirit of the holy church, the true rector," decided to expose "this false spirit" through the following course:

> This woman was seized and abandoned to penalties so that she was tortured, and she then confessed all the truth—how she feigned the aforesaid things from cupidity . . . or perhaps she dedicated herself to the devil in this kind of

> wretched servitude. And she was discovered to have the falling sickness, and hid it under the ecstatic excesses that she feigned.

Opinions varied as to whether she should be condemned as a heretic. But it was eventually decided "by the learned" that she was not a heretic since she was not obdurate. Hence she was admitted to penance.[2]

It is unclear who added this episode and why.[3] The fact that the anonymous mystic's trial purportedly occurred in 1424—the year after the completion of Gerson's treatise, would seem to preclude its presence in its earliest version. Although it is possible that Gerson himself appended this trial at a later date, it seems doubtful. Stylistically, the account lacks Gerson's polish and rhetorical flare—not to mention Gerson's own predilection for painting himself into his own contemporary tableaux. This account was added at the end of the treatise. Therefore it is by no means certain that the interpolator was hoping to pass the exemplum off as part of Gerson's original composition. Yet there can be little doubt that the author believed himself to be writing in the spirit of Gerson. Instead of the alternative conclusion, which had summarized the treatise's chief points, the trial offers a concrete summary—a practical application of the methods set forth in the treatise. The movement from Gerson's wider focus on "teaching" to a case involving female mysticism is telling, as are the details of the woman's spiritual practice. For she is possessed of many of the most distinguished hallmarks of female piety: raptures, extreme abstemiousness, miraculous knowledge of the sins of others, and marvelous penance offered as intercession for souls. The only deviation from this celebrated projection of female sanctity is her claim to intercede in hell, rather than purgatory.[4] There were, of course, heresies such as certain strains of Catharism which denied that God would eternally condemn anyone to hell. And yet given the coherence of the woman's spiritual profile, one cannot help but wonder whether the substitution of hell for purgatory was not a convenient clerical invention—assuming the woman existed. Such an error may have helped to support the need for the harsh tenor of this inquisition (Marguerite Porete had not been tortured; nor had Joan of Arc, for that matter), as opposed to the gentler, more cerebral processes applied to the probation of suspect scholarly teaching. The anonymous mystic's error, in conjunction with the revelation of her epilepsy, would serve to discredit the other manifestations of her piety.

Authors who clearly perceived themselves as successors to Gerson's legacy would increasingly look to inquisitional procedure in its sternest guise for the control of female mysticism. John Nider offers

an exemplary account of an unbound virgin in Regensburg of about fifty-three years of age, whose itinerant life (a fact that foreclosed the possibility of stable confessional practice) and incautious words attracted the attention of the religious authorities. When she was questioned, it emerged that her revelations had allegedly taught her to think of herself as "sinless and incapable of error," "mother of the church of Christ," and as "more blessed than the prince of the apostles when he was alive."[5] She was, moreover, prepared to go to the flames for her beliefs. The archdeacon, however, saw things differently. Applying the bold maxim of the Book of Isaiah (28.19) that "vexation alone will make you understand what you hear," he urged torture as a means of instilling right understanding. But it was suggested to Nider that he preserve the woman's trust by indicating his distaste for this prospect in her presence, then absenting himself from the torture altogether. When interrogated under torture, she denied that she had either teachers or disciples in her errors. Nider recounts:

> I believe she spoke the truth as she was humbled enough by the distress of her limbs. After this, she was led back to the tower where she was kept captive. In the evening of the same day, we visited the wretch (I and my companion) at the order of the lord archdeacon. She was scarcely able to move from pain. Moreover she began to wail in our faces and boldly to plead how gravely she was harmed. Then we, considering that she was humbled and already anticipating us, told her various accounts of how many remarkable and learned men were deceived by incautious revelations and seduced through the angel Satan, and of how fragile the female sex was. Aided by the testimony of Scripture, we persuaded her in many ways. Then through the grace of Christ she began to recover and to promise that she wished to follow me and my companion in all things. Therefore she believed that she was deceived and purged her soul to me through sacramental confession spontaneously concerning all the things she had committed from youth. She exhibited herself publicly revokingher error and did penance. And the third day afterward in the city of Regensburg, with much weeping for joy and mercy, she performed all the aforesaid things to completion.

Obstinate avoidance of the regular discipline of sacramental confession was corrected by a "judicious" application of torture, which, in turn, produced contrition, "spontaneous" confession, conversion, and public penance. The citizens of the community wept to witness so moving a reconciliation enacted within their midst.

In this episode the two kinds of confession are seamlessly joined, as are the clergy's pastoral and coercive functions. Again, this corresponds to the ideology of the inquisitorial manuals. Ugolini had urged the use of every rhetorical means at hand in order to make a heretic return to the faith. But were these to fail, the inquisitor should not flinch from resorting to compulsion, adapting the priest's medicinal function to this end:

> Because . . . such a one was baptized and is bound to the catholic faith, and ought to be compelled to observe and worship it. . . . And this is like the example of a frenzied individual [*phrenetici*], who is bound by the doctor: and the lethargic person, whom the doctor stimulates by torturing. . . . And the bishop and the inquisitor are held to this by the responsibility of their office, who like the shepherd guards his sheep, and gathers up the strays, and leads them back. . . .Because they indeed should imprison, bind, torture, and afflict his body.[6]

The physical proofs once used to ensure the reality of a woman's mystical gifts had given way to the more ancient proof of torture, corresponding to the ways in which many of the clergy's perception of these gifts had changed. As the two types of confession draw closer together, eventually converging, the barriers separating correction, coercion, and even compassion begin to disintegrate.

Gerson cannot be held responsible for the faltering fortunes of women's spirituality. His contribution was simply to articulate forcefully an apprehension about mystical experiences that was already widespread among the clergy, and then to gesture to the most obvious and up-to-date safe-guard against deception: the inquisitional procedure. It is doubtful that he would have recognized the tribunal he envisaged in the trials described above. That Gerson's works on spiritual discernment were bound and circulated amid treatises written for the persecution of witches was perhaps the most tragic of his unintended effects.

[1] Bernard Basin, *De artibus magicis ac magorum maleficiis opus praeclarissimum sacrelegis disquisitoris magistri bernardi basin cesaraugustanensis ecclesie canonicum nuper amendis quam plurimis emendatum* (Paris: Denis Roce, 1506), *propositio* 10.

[2] Anonymous interpolation from Gerson's *De examinatione doctrinarum*, in *Joannis Gersonii opera omnia*, ed. L. Ellies du Pin (Antwerp: Sumptibus societatis, 1706), vol. 1, cols. 19–20.

[3] Anne Schutte supposes that this was Gerson's own work (*Aspiring Saints: Pretense of Holiness, Inquisition, and Gender in the Republic of Venice, 1618–1750* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001], p. 44).

[4] On similar claims made by other female mystics, see chap. 2, p. 77, above.

[5] Nider, *Formicarium* 3.7 (Douai: B. Belleri, 1602), p. 226.

[6] Zanchino Ugolini, *Tractatus de haereticis* c. 33, in *Tractatus universi iuris*, ed. Camillo Campeggi (Venice: Franciscus Zilettus, 1584), fol. 263v.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Manuscript Sources

Alberti, Leandro. *Historie de Bologna divise in cinque Deche (1253–1543)*. Vol 4. Universitaria da Bologna. MS ital., 204.

Bartholomeus of Pisa. *Summa de casibus conscience secundum compilacionem Bartholomei de Pisis*. Oxford. Bodleian MS, 736.

De ornamentis mulierum. Oxford. Bodleian MS, 361, fols. 480–93.

Doat Collection. Paris, Biblioth[egrave]que Nationale.

d'Oglio, Elena. *Testamento della Beata Elena figlia del quidem ser Siverio da duglido cittadino, e tesaro di Bologna, vedova e moglie del gia` ser' Benedetto dall'Olio cittadino pure, et nat. di Bologna*. Bologna. Biblotheca Archiganasio, MS B, 374.

John of Dambach. *Liber de consolacione humane vite vel De consolacione theologiae*. Oxford, Bodleian MS, 881, fols. 135r–79v.

Peter of Luca. *Narrativa della Vite, e Morte della Beata Elena Duglioli dall'Oglio*. Bologna. Bibliotheca Archiganasio. MS Gozzadini, 292.

Processus. Clare of Montefalco. Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Riti, Proc. 676.

Tractus breuis: penitentibus tamen utilis. de modo confessionis. ac et inquisitionibus faciendis de peccatis. Oxford. Bodleian MS, 555.

Printed Sources

Abelard, Peter. "Incipiunt glossae secundum magistrum Petrum Abaelardum super Porphyrium." *Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters* 21 (1933):

1–32.

Alan of Lille. *Liber poenitentialis*. Ed. Jean Longe`re. Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia, 17–18. Louvain: Nauwelaerts; Lille: Librairie Giard, 1965.

Albert the Great. *Quaestiones*. In *Opera omnia*, vol. 25, ed. Bernhard Geyer.

Aschendorff: Monasterium Westfalorum, 1993.

Albric. *Albrici monachi Triumfontium Chronicon*. Ed. P. Scheffer-Boichorst.

MGH SS, 23:631–950.

Alexander of Hales. *Quaestiones disputatae "Antequam esset fratrem"*. Ed. Fathers of the College of Saint Bonaventure. 3 vols. Florence: College of Saint Bonaventure, 1960.

An Alphabet of Tales: An English Fifteenth Century Translation of the Alpha-betum narrationum of Etienne de Besan ç on. Ed. M. M. Banks. *EETS*, o.s., nos.

126–27. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Tru ö bner, 1904 and 1905.

Alphonse of Pecha. *Alfonso of Jaén: His Life andWorks*. Ed. Arne Jo ö nsson. Lund:
Lund University Press, 1989.
Ambrose. *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam*. Ed. M. Adriaen. *CCSL*, 14.
Turnhout: Brepols, 1957.
Amelius, Peter. *Ordo Romanus*. *Museum Italicum seu Veterum scriptorum ex bibliothecis italicis*. Ed. Dom. Mabillon. 2 vols. Paris: Lutetia, 1724.
Angela of Foligno. *Il libro della Beata Angela da Foligno*. Ed. Ludger Thier and Abele Calufetti. Grottaferrata, Rome: College of Saint Bonaventure, 1985.
Trans. Paul Lachance. In *Angela of Foligno: Complete Works*, 123–318. New York: Paulist Press, 1993.
Annales Wormatiensis. Ed. G. H. Pertz. *MGH SS*, 17:34–74.
Antoninus of Florence. *Confessionale Anthonini*. Paris: Jehan Petit, 1507?
Aragonius, Nicholas. *Vita Gregorii Papae IX*. In *RIS*, 3,1:575–87.
Augustine. *De civitate dei*. Ed. Bernardus Dombart and Alphonsus Kalb. 2 vols.
CCSL, 47, 48. Turnhout: Brepols, 1955. Trans. H. Bettenson. *City of God*.
Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1972.
Avicenna. *Liber canonis*. Venice, 1507. Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964. Balmé, Francis, and Celsus Paban, eds. *Raymundiana*. Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum Historica, VI, 1–2. Rome: In Domo Generalitia; Stuttgart: J. Roth, 1898, 1901.
Basin, Bernard. *De artibus magicis ac magorum malificiis opus praeclarissimum sacrelegis disquisitoris magistri bernardi basin cesaragustanensis ecclesie canonicum nuper amendis quam plurimis emendatum*. Paris: Denis Roce, 1506. Bede. *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. Ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.
Benedetti, Marina, ed. *Milano 1300: I processi inquisitoriali contro le devote e i devoti di santa Guglielma*. Milan: Libri Scheiwiller, 1999.
Bernard of Cauxand John of Saint Pierre. *Processus inquisitionis*. Trans. Walter Wakefield. In *Heresy, Crusade, and Inquisition in Southern France, 1100–1250*, 250–58. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1974.
Bernard of Clairvaux. *De discretione spirituum* or *De septem spiritibus*. Serm.
23. *PL* 183, cols. 600–603.
——. *De recto usu donorum Dei*. Serm. 88. *PL* 183, cols. 706–7.
Bernardino of Siena. *De inspirationum discretione*. In *Opera omnia*, ed. Fathers of the College of Saint Bonaventure, 7:243–90. Florence:

College of Saint Bonaventure, 1959.

Beutler, Magdalena. “Erklaerung des Vaterunsers: A Critical Edition of a Fifteenth-Century Mystical Treatise by Magdalena Beutler of Freiburg.” Ed.

Karen Greenspan. Ph.D. diss., University of Massachusetts, 1984.

Bevegnati, Giunta. *Vita B. Margaritae de Cortona*. *AA SS*, February, 3: 305–63.

Bihl, Michael, ed. “Statuta Generalia Ordinis edita in capitulis generalibus celebratis Narbonae an. 1260, Assisii an. 1279 atque Parisiis an. 1292. Editio critica et synoptica. Indexspecialis.” *AFH* 34 (1941): 13–94, 284–358.

Blamires, Alcuin, ed. *Woman Defamed and Woman Defended: An Anthology of Medieval Texts*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.

Boccaccio, Giovanni. *The Decameron*. Trans. G. H. McWilliam. Harmonds-worth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1981.

Bo ö hmer, J. F., and C. Will, eds. *Regesta Archiepiscoporum Maguntinensium*. 2 vols. Innsbruck: Wagner, 1877–86.

Bollandists, ed. “Proce`sverbal du dernier consistoire secret préparatoire [agrave] la canonisation. ” In “S. Pierre Célestin et ses premiers biographes.” *AB* 16 (1897):

475–87.

Bonaventure. *Commentaria in quatuor libros sententiarum magistri Petri Lombardi*. In *Opera omnia*, vols. 1–4, ed. Fathers of the College of Saint Bonaventure. Florence: College of Saint Bonaventure, 1882–1902.

———. *Legenda Sancti Francisci*. In ibid., 8:544–64.

———. Opusc. XIV, *Quare fratres minores praedicent et confessiones audiant*. In ibid., 8:375–85.

———. *Vitis mystica sive Tractatus de passione Domini*. In ibid., 8:159–229.

Bridget of Sweden. *Sancta Birgitta Revelaciones Book V*. Ed. Birger Bergh. Uppsala: Almquist and Wiksells, 1971. Trans. Albert Kezel. In *Birgitta of Sweden:*

Life and Selected Revelations, 99–156. New York: Paulist Press, 1990.

Browe, Peter, ed. *De Ordaliis*. 2 vols. Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana. Textus et Documenta, nos. 4, 11. Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1932, 1933.

Brugeman, John. *Vita posterior B. Lidwinae virginis*. *AA SS*, April, 2:302–60.

———. *Vita prior Lidwinae virginis*. *AA SS*, April, 2:270–301.

Burchard of Worms. *Decretum libri viginti*. *PL* 140, cols. 537–1058.

Caesarius of Heisterbach. “Des Ca ö sarius von Heisterbach Schriften u ö ber die hl.

Elisabeth von Thu ö ringen.” Ed. Albert Huyskens. *Annalen des historischen Vereins fu ö r den Niederrhein* 86 (1908): 1–59.

———. *Dialogus miraculorum*. Ed. Joseph Strange. 2 vols. Cologne, Bonn, Brussels: J. M. Heberle, 1851. Trans. H. Von E. Scott and C. C. Swinton Bland. *The Dialogue on Miracles*. 2 vols. London: Routledge, 1929.

———.*DieWundergeschichten des Caesarius von Heisterbach*. Ed. Alfons Hilka.

3 vols. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1933–37.

Carletti, Angelo. *Summa angelica de casibus conscientialibus*. Venice: Iac. Sanouinum, 1569.

Carolus-Barré, Louis, ed. "Consultation du Cardinal Pietro Colonna sur le IIe miracle de Saint Louis." *Biblioth[egrave]que de l'Ecole des Chartes* 117 (1959):

57–72.

Cassian, John. *Conféréences*. Ed. and trans. E. Pichery. 3 vols. *SC*, 42, 54, 64. Paris:

Editions du Cerf, 1955–59. Trans. Boniface Ramsey. *Conferences*. New York:

Paulist Press, 1997.

Catherine of Siena. *Libro della divina dottrina volgarmente detto Dialogo della Divina Provvidenza*. Ed. Matilde Fiorilli. 2d ed. Bari: G. Laterza and Sons, 1928. Trans. Suzanne Noffke. *Catherine of Siena: The Dialogue*. New York:

Paulist Press, 1980.

Catton, Walter. "The Second Question of the Prologue to Walter Catton's Commentary on the Sentences." In *Nine Medieval Thinkers: A Collection of Hitherto Unedited Texts*, ed. J. Reginald O'Donnell, 233–69. Toronto: Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies, 1955.

Chronicon Erfordiense. Ed. G. H. Pertz. *MGH SS*, 16:26–40.

Climacus, John. *Scala paradisi*. *PG* 88, cols. 585–1248. Trans. Colm Luibheid and Norman Russell. *The Ladder of Divine Ascent*. New York: Paulist Press, 1982.

Collijn, Isak, ed. *Acta et processus canonizacionis Beate Birgitte*. Uppsala: Alm-quist and Wiksells, 1924–31.

Constance of Rabastens. "Les révélations de Constance de Rabastens et le schisme d'Occident." Ed. Noeïl Valois. *Annales du Midi* 8 (1986): 241–78.

D'Ailly, Peter. *De falsis prophetis*. In *Joannis Gersonii opera omnia*, ed. L. Ellies du Pin, 1:489–603. Antwerp: Sumptibus societatis, 1706.

———. *Quaestio: Utrum conscientia erronea excusat a culpa*. In ibid., 1:489–603.

———. *Quaestiones magistri Petri de Alliaco Cardinalis cameracensis super primum tertium et quartum sententiarum*. Paris: Jehan Petit, 1505?

———. *Tractatus de materia concilii generalis*. In *The Political Thought of Pierre d'Ailly: The Voluntarist Tradition*, ed. Francis Oakley, app. 3,

244–342. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

David of Augsburg. *Tractatus de haeresi pauperum de Lugduno*. In *Thesaurus novorum anecdotorum*, ed. E. Marte`ne and U. Durand, vol. 5, cols. 1777–94.

Paris: Lutetia, 1717. Reprint, New York: Burt Franklin, 1968.

Denifle, Heinrich, ed. *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*. 4 vols. Paris: Fratres Delalain, 1889–97.

De bono et maligno spiritu. Ed. Noeïl Valois. In "Un nouveau témoignage sur Jeanne d'Arc: réponse d'un clerc parisien a` l'apologie de la pucelle par Gerson (1429)." *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Sociétéd'histoire de France* 43 (1906):

161–79.

Denis the Carthusian. *De contemplatione libri tres*. In *D. Dionysi Cartusiani opera omnia in unum corpus digesta*, 41. *Opera minora*, 9:135–289. Tournai:

Typis Carthusiae S. M. de Pratis, 1911.

———. *De discretione et examinatione spirituum*. In ibid., vol. 4, *Opera minora*, 8:267–319.

Dietrich of Apolda. *Die Vita der heiligen Elisabeth des Dietrich von Apolda*. Ed.

Monika Rener. Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1993.

Disticha Catonis. Ed. Marcus Boas. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co.,

1952.

Doctrina de modo procendendi contra haereticos. In *Thesaurus novorum anecdotorum*, ed. E. Marte`ne and U. Durand, vol. 5, cols. 1796–1822. Paris: Lutetia, 1717. Reprint, New York: Burt Franklin, 1968.

Do ö llinger, Ignatius von, ed., *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*. 2 vols.

Munich: C. H. Beck'sche, 1890.

Douais, Célestin. *Documents pour servir [agrave] l'histoire de l'inquisition dans le Languedoc*. 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1900.

Durand, William. *-Age*. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1940.

Duvernoy, Jean, ed. *Le Registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier, év ê que de Pamiers (1318–1325)*. 3 vols. Toulouse: E. Privat, 1965.

Elisabeth of Scho ö nau. *Visionen der hl. Elisabeth*. Ed. F.W.E. Roth. Bru ö nn: Raigerner Benedictiner Buchruckerei, 1884. Trans. Anne Clark. *Elisabeth of Scho ö nau: The Complete Works*. New York: Paulist Press, 2000.

Este, Ercole d'. *Spiritualium personarum feminei sexus facta admiratione digna.*

Transumpta quedam ex parte Sororis Lucie quarundamque aliarum Sororumnuncupate de tercia Regula diui patris Dominici ordinis

predicatorum primi fundatoris: quorum originalia cum quibusdam notabilibus testimoniis habentur in Conuentu Nurmburgensi eiusdem ordinis. Nuremberg, 1501?

Eubel, Conrad, ed. *Bullarii Franciscani epitome: sive Summa bullarum in eiusdem bullarii quattuor prioribus tomis relatorum addito supplemento*. Florence: College of Saint Bonaventure, 1908.

Eymeric, Nicolas. *Directorium inquisitorium . . . denuo ex collatione plurium ex-emplorum emendatum, et accessione multarum literarum Apostolicarum*. Rome: In aedibus Pop. Rom., 1578.

Florentinus, Petrus. *Vita B. Margaritae Faventinae*. *AA SS*, August, 5:845–54.

Foucois, Gui. *Quaestiones quindecim ad inquisitores*. In *Tractatus de officio sanctissimae inquisitionis et modo procedendi in causis Fidei*, ed. Caesar Carena, app., 399–432. Cremona: Baptistam Belpierum, 1655.

Francis of Assisi. *Opuscula sancti patris Francisci*. Ed. Cajetan Esser. Grottaferrata, Rome: College of Saint Bonaventure, 1978.

Fredericq, Paul, ed. *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis Neerlandicae*. 5 vols. Ghent: J. Vuylsteke; The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1896–1906.

Friedlander, Alan, ed. *Processus Bernardi Delitiosi: The Trial of Fr. Bernard Déli-cieux, 3 September–8 December 1319*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1996.

Gaetani, James. “In negotio fratris Petri de Murrone.” “De eadem canonizatione sancti Petri.” In *Die Zeremonienbu ö cher der ro ö mischen Kurie im Mittelalter*, ed. Bernhard Schimmelpfennig, 167–70, 170–73. Tubingen: MaxNiermeyer , 1973.

——. *Ordo Romanus*. In *Museum Italicum*, ed. Dom. Mabillon, 2:418–24.

Paris: Lutetia, 1689.

Galen. *De melancholia*. In *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, ed. C. G. Ku ö hn, 19:699–720. Leipzig, 1830. Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1965.

——. *On the Affected Parts*. Trans. R. E. Siegel. Basel: S. Karger, 1968.

——. *On the Passions and Errors of the Soul*. Trans. P.W. Harkins. Columbus:

Ohio State University Press, 1963.

Gandini, Luigi, ed. *Sulla venuta in Ferrara della beata suor Lucia da Narni*. Modena: Societa` tipografica, 1901.

Gerson, John. *The Concept of “Discretio spirituum” in John Gerson’s “De probatione spirituum” and “De distinctione verarum visionum a falsis”*. Trans.

Paschal Boland. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1959.

——. *Jean Gerson: Early Works*. Trans. Brian McGuire. New York:

Paulist Press, 1998.

——. *Jean Gerson: Selections from "A Deo exivit," "Contra curiositatem studentium," and "De mystica theologia speculativa"*. Trans. Steven Ozment.

Leiden: Brill, 1969.

——.*Joannis Gersonii opera omnia*. Ed. L. Ellies du Pin. 2 vols. Antwerp: Sumptibus societatis, 1706.

——. *Oeuvres comple`tes*. Ed. Palémon Glorieux. 10 vols. Paris: Desclée, 1960–73.

Gerson, Jean, et al. *Le Débat sur le Roman de la Rose*. Ed. Erik Hicks. Paris:

HonoréChampion, 1977.

Gestorum Treverorum continuatio quarta. Ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS*, 24:390–404. Gilbert of Tournai. *Collectio de scandalis ecclesiae*. Ed. Autbertus Stroick. *AFH* 24 (1931): 33–62.

Glossa ordinaria. In *Textus Biblie cum glosa ordinaria, Nicolai de Lyra postilla, moralitatibus eiusdem*. 6 vols. in 5. Basel: Johannes Petri et Johannes Frobenius, 1506–8.

Gobi, Jean. *La Scala coeli*. Ed. Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu. Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1991.

Godefroid of Fontaines. *Les Quodlibets onze–quatorze de Godefroid de Fontaines*. Ed. J. Hoffmans. Vol. 5, fasc. 1–2. Louvain: Editions de l'Institut Supe è rieur de Philosophie, 1932.

Goffred of Trani. *Summa super titulis Decretalium*. Lyon: Neudruck der Ausgabe, 1519.

Gratian. *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*. Ed. A. Friedberg. In *Corpus Iuris Canonici*.

2d ed. Vol. 1. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz, 1879. Reprint, Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1955.

Gregory I (the Great). *Dialogues*. Ed. Adalbert de Vogué. Trans. Paul Antin. *SC*, nos. 251, 260, 265. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1978–80. Trans. O. J. Zimmerman, *FC*, 39. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1959.

——. *Moralia in Iob*. Ed. Mark Adriaen. 3 vols. *CCSL*, 143, 143a, 143b. Turnhout: Brepols, 1979–85.

Gregory IX. "Die heilige Elisabeth und Papst Gregor IX." Ed. KarlWenck. *Hochland* 2 (1907): 128–48.

——. *Les Registres de Grégoire IX*. Ed. Lucien Auvray. 4 vols. Paris: Albert Fontemoing, 1896–1955.

Gregory IX et al. *Decretalium Collectiones*. Ed. A. Friedberg. In *Corpus Iuris Canonici*. 2d ed. Vol. 2. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz, 1879. Reprint, Graz: Akade-mische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1955.

Gregory of Rimini. *Gregorii Ariminensis OESA Lectura super primum et secundum Sententiarum*. Ed. A. Damasus Trapp. 7 vols. to date. Berlin:

Walter de Gruyter, 1984.

Gui, Bernard. *De fundatione et prioribus conventuum provinciarum Tolosanae et provinciae Ordinis Praedicatorum*. Ed. P. A. Amargier. Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum Historica, 24. Rome: Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1961.

——. *Practica inquisitionis hereticae*. Ed. Célestin Douais. Paris: Alphonse Pi-card, 1886.

——. *Vita Gregorii IX*. In *RIS*, 3,1:570–74.

Guillaume de Nangis. *Gesta Philippi tertii Francorum regis*. In *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed. Danou et Naudet, 20:466–559. Paris: Imprimerie Royal, 1840.

Henniges, Diodorus, ed. "Vita S. Elisabeth, Langraviae Thuringiae." *AFH* 2 (1909): 240–68. [Life proper on pp. 250–68.]

Henry of Friemar. *Tractatus de quatuor instinctibus*. In *Insignis atque preclarus de deliciis sensibilibus paradisi liber: cum singulari tractatu de quatuor instinctibus*. Venice: Iacobus Pentius, 1498.

Henry of Ghent. *Henrici a Gandava: Quodlibet VII*. Ed. G. A. Wilson. In *Opera omnia*, vol. 11. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991.

——. *Henrici a Gandava: Quodlibet IX*. Ed. R. Macken. In ibid, vol. 13.

——. *M. Henrici a Gandava . . . Quodlibeta*. 2 vols. Venice: Jacobus de Franciscus, 1613.

Henry of Langenstein. *Heinrichs von Langenstein "Unterscheidung der Geister"*

Lateinisch und Deutsch. Ed. Thomas Hohman. Munich: Artemis Verlag, 1977.

——.*Secreta sacerdotum magistri Henrici de Hassia. Que sibi placent vel displicent in missa*. Augsburg: Johannes Froschauer, 1503.

Holkot, Robert. *In quatuor libros sententiarum quaestiones*. London, 1518. Re-print, Frankfurt: Minerva, 1967.

Hostiensis. *In tertium Decretalium librum commentaria*. Venice: Iuntas, 1581.

Huyskens, Albert, ed. *Quellenstudien zur Geschichte der hl. Elisabeth Landgräfin von Thu ö ringen*. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche, 1908.

——, ed. *Der sog. Libellus de dictis quatuor ancillarum S. Elisabeth confectus*. Kempten and Munich: Jos. Ko ö sel'schen, 1911.

Innocent IV. *Commentaria: Apparatus in V libros Decretalium*. Frankfurt, 1570.

Reprint, Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1968.

Isidore of Seville. *Sententiae*. *PL* 83, cols. 537–738.

Jacobilli, Luigi. *Vite de' santi e beati dell'Vmbria*. 3 vols. in 2. Foligno: Appresso Agostino Alterij, 1647–61.

James of Viterbo. *Jacobi de Viterbio O. E. S. A. Disputatio secunda de Quolibet*. Ed. Eelcko Ypma. Wu ö rzburg: Augustinus, 1969.

James of Vitry. *The Exempla or Illustrative Stories from the Sermones Vulgares of Jacques de Vitry*. Ed. Thomas Frederick Crane. Folk-Lore Society Publications, 26. London: Folk-Lore Society, 1878. Reprint, Nendeln, Liechtenstein:
Kraus, 1878.
——.*Historia Occidentalis of Jacques de Vitry*. Ed. John Frederick Hinnebusch.
Fribourg: University Press of Fribourg, 1972.
——. *Lettres de Jacques de Vitry*. Ed. R.B.C. Huygens. Leiden: Brill, 1960.
——. Selections from his *Sermones vulgares*. In *Analecta Novissima Spicilegii Solesmensis altera continuatio*, ed. J. B. Pitra, vol. 2, *Tusculana*, 344–465. Paris:
Roger and Chernowitz, 1888.
——.*Vita B. Mariae Oigniacensis*, *AA SS*, June, 5:547–72. Trans. Margot King.
The Life of Marie d'Oignies. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Peregrina, 1986.
James of Voragine. *Legenda aurea*. Ed. Giovanni Maggioni. 2 vols. Florence: Sismel, 1998. Trans. Granger Ryan. *The Golden Legend*. 2 vols. Princeton, N.J.:
Princeton University Press, 1993.
Jerome. *Commentaria in Epistola ad Ephesios*. *PL* 26, cols. 467–590.
——. *Commentaria in Epistola ad Philemonem*. *PL* 26, cols. 635–56.
——. *Epistulae*. Ed. I. Hilberg. *CSEL*, 55. Rev. and supplemented ed. Vienna:
Verlag der o ö sterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996.
John of Freiburg. *Summa confessorum*. Rome: n.p., 1518.
John of Marienwerder. "Die Beichten der seligen Dorothea von Montau." Ed.
Franz Hipler. In *Zeitschrift fu ö r die Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ermlands* 6 (1877): 147–83.
——. *Liber de festis Magistri Johannis Marienwerder offenbarungen der Dorothea von Montau*. Ed. Anneliese Triller. Forschungen und Quellen zur Kirchenund Kulturgeschichte Ostdeutschlands, vol. 25. Cologne: Bo ö hlau, 1992.
——. *Septililium B. Dorotheae*. Ed. Franz Hipler. *AB* (1883): 381–472 (treatise 1); 3 (1884): 113–40, 408–48 (treatises 2–3); 4 (1885): 207–51 (treatises 4–7).
——. *Vita B. Dorotheae Lindana*. In *AA SS*, October, 13:498–560.
——. *Vita Dorotheae Montoviensis Magistri Johannis Marienwerder*. Ed. Hans Westpfahl. Forschungen und Quellen zur Kirchenund Kulturgeschichte Ostdeutschlands, vol. 1. Cologne and Graz: Bo ö hlau, 1964.

Jordan of Saxony. *Liber Vitasfratrum*. Ed. Rudolph Arbesmann and Winfrid Hu ö mpfner. New York: Cosmopolitan Science, 1943.

Ka ö ppelli, Thomas, ed. “Une Somme contre les hérétiques de S. Pierre Martyr (?).”

AFP 17 (1947): 294–335.

Kempe, Margery. *The Book of Margery Kempe*. Ed. Sanford Meech and Hope Allen. *EETS*, o.s., no. 212. London: Oxford University Press, 1940.

Lea, H. C., ed. *A Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary in the Thirteenth Century*.

Philadelphia: Lea Bros., 1892.

Le Graveur, John. *Entre Dieu et Satan: les visions d’Ermine de Reims (*] *1396*).

Ed. Claude Arnaud-Gillet. Florence: Sismel, Edizione del Galluzzo, 1997.

Lemay, Helen Rodnite, trans.*Women’s Secrets: A Translation of Pseudo-Albertus Magnus’s “De Secretis Mulierum” with Commentaries*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.

Limborch, Philippus von. *Historia inquisitionis cui subiungitur Liber sententiarum inquisitionis Tholosonae*. Amsterdam: Henricus Wetstenium, 1692.

Longpré, E., ed. “Fr. Rogeri Marston et anonymi doctoris OFM quaestiones ineditae de B. Francisci stigmatibus.“ *Antonianum* 7 (1932): 239–44.

Lugnano, Placido Tommaso, ed. *I processi inediti per Francesca Bussa dei Ponzi-ani (Santa Francesca Romana, 1440–1453)*. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1945.

Mansi, G. D., ed. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*. 53 vols. in 60. Paris: H. Welter, 1901–27.

Marcianese, G. *Narratione della nascita, vita, e morte della B. Lucia da Narni*.

Ferrara: V. Buldini, 1616.

Matteotti, John. *Acta S. Franciscae Romanae*. *AA SS*, March, 2:93–178.

Meersseman, G. G., ed. “Le deposizioni delle compagne di S. Elisabetta di Turingia in un frammento conservato nell’archivio di stato a Friburgo.” In *Palaeographica diplomatica et archivistica: studi in onore di Giulio Battelli*, ed. Scuola speciale archivisiti e bibliotecari dell’Universita` di Roma, 1:367–80. Rome:

Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1979.

Melloni, Giovambattista. *Atti o memorie degli uomini illustri in santit[agrave] nati, o morti in Bologna*. 6 vols. Bologna: Lelio della volpe, 1773.

Menesto` , Enrico, ed. *Il processo di canonizzazione di Chiara da*

Montefalco. Regione dell'Umbria: La Nuova Italia, 1984.

Menesto` , Enrico, and Stefano Brufani, eds. *Fontes Franciscani*. Assisi: Edizioni Porziuncola, 1995.

Mohan, Gaudens, ed. "Petrus Thomae on the Stigmata of St. Francis." *Franciscan Studies* 8 (1948): 285–94.

Molanus, John. *Natales sanctorum Belgii*. Louvain: Ioannes Masius and Philippus Zangrius, 1595.

Mouket, Philip. *Historia regum francorum*. Ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGH SS*, 26:718–821.

Nicholas of Lyre. *Textus Biblie cum glosa ordinaria, Nicolai de Lyra postilla, moralitatibus eiusdem*. 6 vols. in 5. Basel: Johannes Petri et Johannes Frobenius, 1506–8.

Nider, John. *Confessionale seu manuale confessorum fratris Johannis Nyder ad instructionem spiritualem pastorum valde necessarium*. Paris: Jehan Petit, n.d.

——. *Consolatorum timorate conscientie*. Paris: Jehan Petit, 1502?

——. *Formicarium*. Douai: B. Belleri, 1602.

Olafson, Prior Peter, and Master Peter Olafson. *Vita b. Brigide*. Ed. Isak Collijn.

In *Acta et processus canonizacionis Beate Birgitte*, 73–101. Uppsala: Almquist and Wiksells, 1924–31. Trans. Albert Kezel. In *Birgitta of Sweden: Life and Selected Revelations*, 69–98. New York: Paulist Press, 1990.

Oliger, Livarius, ed. "Acta inquisitoris Umbriae Fr. Angeli de Assisio contra stigmata S. Francisci negantem contra fraticellos aliosque, a. 1361." *AFH* 24 (1931): 63–90.

Ovid. *Ovid: The Art of Love and Other Poems*. Trans. J. H. Mozley. 2d ed. Loeb Classical Library, Ovid, II. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Panormitanus. *Commentaria in quartum et quintum Decretalium Librum*. 7 vols.

in 3. London: Cum privilegio regis Philippo Tinghio, 1586.

Paolini, Lorenzo, ed. *Il "De officio inquisitionis": La procedura inquisitoriale a Bologna e a Ferrara nel Trecento*. 2 vols. Bologna: Editrice Universitaria Bolo-gnina, 1976.

Paolini, Lorenzo, and Raniero Orioli, eds. *Acta S. Officii Bononie: ab anno 1291 usque ad annum 1310*. Fonti per la storia d'Italia, no. 106. 2 parts plus index.

Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, 1982–84.

A Parisian Journal: 1405–1449.Trans. Janet Shirley. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

Pelhisson, William. *Chronique (1229–1244), Suivie de récit des troubles d'Albi (1234)*. Ed. and trans. Jean Duvernoy. Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1994.

Peter of Dacia. *Acta B. Christinae Stumbelensis*. *AA SS*, June, 5:236–67.

Peter of Poitiers. *Summa de confessione. Compilatio praesens*. Ed. Jean Longe`re.

CCCM, 51. Turnhout: Brepols, 1980.

Peters, Edward, ed. *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980.

Petroff, Elizabeth, trans. *Women's Visionary Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Philip of Clairvaux. "Vita Elizabeth sanctimonialis in Erkenrode, Ordinis Cisterciensis." In *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum bibliothecae regiae bruxellensis*, ed. Bollandists, 1:362–78. Brussels: Polleunis, Ceuterick et de Smet, 1886.

Piergili, Battista. *Vita della B. Chiara detta della Croce da Montefalco*. Foligno:

Agostino Alterij, 1640.

Pomponazzi, Pietro. *De naturalium effectuum admirandorum causis, seu De incantationibus liber*. In *Opera*. Basel: Exofficina Henricpetrina, 1567.

Poncelet, A., ed. "Vita beatae Margaritae virginis de civitate Castelli." *AB* 19 (1900): 21–36.

Quicherat, Jules, ed. *Proce`s de condamnation et de réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc*.

5 vols. Paris: Renouard, 1841–49.

Raymond of PeÑafort. *Summa de poenitentia et matrimonio*. Rome: Joannes Tallini, 1603.

Richard of Saint Victor. *Benjamin minor*. *PL* 196, cols. 1–64.

——. *De quatuor gradibus violentiae caritatis*. *PL* 196, cols. 1207–24.

Richer of Sens. *Richeri Gesta Senoniensis ecclesiae*. Ed. G. Waitz. *MGH SS*, 25:249–345.

Robert of Courson. "Robert of Courson on Penance." Ed. V. L. Kennedy. *Mediaeval Studies* 7 (1945): 291–336.

Robine, Marie. "Le 'Livre de révélations' de Marie Robine: étude et édition." Ed.

Matthew Tobin. *MEFRM* 98 (1986): 229–64.

Rodenberg, C., ed. *MGH Ep. Saec. XIII*. 3 vols.

Salimbene de Adam. *The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*. Trans. Joseph Baird et al. Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1986.

Scalza, Giacomo. *Leggenda latina della B. Giovanna detta Vanna d'Orvieto del Terz' Ordine di S. Domenico*. Ed. and trans. V. Marreddu. Orvieto: Sperandeo Pompei, 1853.

Serra, JoséRuis, ed. *San Raimundo de Penyafort: Diplomatorio*. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona, Facultad de Derecho, 1954.

Severus, Sulpicius. *Vie de Saint Martin*. Ed. Jacques Fontaine. 3 vols. *SC*, nos.
133–35. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1967–69. Trans. Alexander Roberts. *The Life of Saint Martin*. *LNPNF*, 11:3–17. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Eerdman's, 1964.
Simonetti, Adele, ed. *Le Vite di Umilt[agrave] da Faenza: Agiografia trecentesca dal latino al volgare*. Florence: Sismel, Edizione de Galuzzo, 1997.
Sommerfeldt, Gustav, ed. "Die Prophetien der hl. Hildegard von Bingen in einem Schreiben des Magisters Heinrich v. Langenstein (1383), und Langensteins Trostbrief u ö ber den Tod eines Bruders des Wormser Bischofs Eckard von Ders (um 1384)." *Historisches Jahrbuch* 30 (1909): 43–61.
Stachnik, Richard, ed. *Die Akten des Kanonisationsprozesses Dorotheas von Montau von 1394 bis 1521*. Cologne and Vienna: Bo ö hlau, 1978.
Stephen of Bourbon. *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues tirés du recueil inédit d'Etienne de Bourbon*. Ed. A. Lecoy de la Marche. Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1877.
Taberner, Gonza é lez Fernando Valls, ed. *Literatura Juri è dica: Estudios de ciencia juri è da e historia del pensamiento cano é nica y politico catala é n, franca è n e italiano*.
Barcelona: Promociones Publicaciones Universitarias, 1986.
Tanner, Norman, ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Council*. 2 vols. London: Sheed and Ward, 1990.
Theodoric of Thuringia. *Libri octo de S. Elizabeth*. In *Thesaurus monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et historicum*, ed. H. Canisius, 4:116–52. Antwerp: Rudolph and Gerhard Wetstenios, 1725.
Thomas a` Kempis. *Lydwine of Schiedam, Virgin*. Ed. and trans. Vincent Scully.
London: Burns and Oates, 1912.
Thomas Aquinas. *Expositio in librum beati Job*. In *Opera omnia*, 14:1–147.
Parma: Petrus Fiaccadori, 1863.
——. *Expositio super Dionysium de divinis nominibus*. In *Opuscula omnia*, ed. P. Mandonnet, 2:220–654. Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1927.
——. *Opera omnia: Quaestiones de quolibet*. Vol. 25, pts. 1–2. Ed. Ordo Fratrum Praedicatorum. Rome: Commissio Leonina, 1996.
——. *Quaestiones disputatae*. Ed. P. Bazzi et al. 8th rev. ed. 2 vols. Turin and Rome: Maretti, 1949.
——. *Scriptum super libros sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi*. Ed. Maria Fabianus Moos. 4 vols. Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1929–47.
——. *Summa theologiae*. 61 vols. London: Blackfriars, in conjunction with Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1964–81.
Thomas of Cantimpré. *Bonum universale de apibus*. Douai: B. Belleri,

1627.

——. *Liber de natura rerum*. Vol. 1. Ed. H. Boese. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1973.

——."Primitive Versions of Thomas of Cantimpré's *Vita Lutgardis*." Ed. Guido Hendrix. *C î teaux* 29 (1978): 153–206.

——. *Supplementum ad Vitam S. Mariae Oigniacensis*, *AA SS*, June, 5:572–81.

Trans. Margot King. *Supplement to the Life of Marie d'Oignies*. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Peregrina, 1987.

——. *Vita Christinae Mirabilis*. *AA SS*, July, 5:637–60. Trans. Margot King.

The Life of Christina of Saint Trond. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Peregrina, 1986.

——. *Vita Lutgardis*. *AA SS*, June, 6:187–209. Trans. Margot King. *The Life of Lutgard of Aywie`res*. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Peregrina, 1987.

——. *Vita Margarete de Ypris*. Ed. G. Meersseman. Appendixof "Les fre`res pr ê cheurs et le mouvement dévot en Flandre au XIIIe sie`cles." *AFP* 18 (1948):

106–30. Trans. Margot King. *The Life of Margaret of Ypres*. Toronto: Peregrina, 1999.

Tisset, Pierre, ed. *Proc[egrave]s de condamnation de Jeanne d'Arc*. 3 vols. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1960–71.

Trithemius, John. *Annales Hirsaugienses complectens historiam Franciae et Germaniae*. 2 Vols. Saint Gall: Monastery of Saint Gall, 1690.

Ugolini, Zanchino. *Tractatus de haereticis*. In *Tractatus universi iuris*, ed. Camillo Campeggi, vol. 11, pt. 2, 234–69. Venice: Franciscus Zilettus, 1584.

Verdeyen, Paul, ed. "Le proc[egrave]s d'inquisition contre Marguerite Porete et Guiard de Cressonessart (1309–1310)." *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 81 (1986):

47–94.

Vincent of Beauvais. *Speculum quadruplex; sive Speculum maius*. 4 vols. Douai:

B. Belleri, 1624.

Von der Hardt, Hermann, ed. *Magnum oecumenicum Constantiense Concilium*. 6 vols in 2. Frankfurt and Leipzig: Christianius Genschius, 1697–1700.

Wack, Mary, ed. *Lovesickness in the Middle Ages: The "Viaticum" and Its Commentaries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.

Wakefield,Walter, and Austin Evans, eds. *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.

William of Auvergne. *Opera omnia*. 2 vols. Paris: A. Pralard, 1674.

Reprint, Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1963.

William of Ockham. *Quodlibeta septem*. Ed. Joseph Wey. In *Guillelmi de Ockham: Opera philosophica et theologica*, vol. 9. Saint Bonaventure, N.Y.: Saint Bonaventure University, 1980. Trans. Alfred Freddoso and Francis Kelley.

Quodlibetal Questions. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

William of Puylaurens. *Chronique. Cronica Magistri Guillelmi de Podio Laurentii*. Ed. and trans. Jean Duvernoy. Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Re-cherche Scientifique, 1976.

William of Rennes. Glosses in Raymond of PeÑafort's *Summa de poenitentia et matrimonio*. Rome: Joannes Tallini, 1603.

Zanella, Gabriele, ed. *Itinerari ereticali: patari e catari tra Rimini e Verona*. Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, Studi storici, fasc. 153. Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, 1986.

Zeumer, Karl, ed. *Formulae Merowingici et Karolini Aevi: Ordines Iudiciorum Dei. MGH, Legum Sectio V. Formulae*.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abulafia, David. *Frederick II: A Medieval Emperor*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Anciaux, Paul. "Le sacrement de pénitence chez Guillaume d'Auvergne." *Ephemerides Theologiae Lovaniensis* 24 (1948): 98–118.

———.*La Théologie du sacrement de pénitence au XIIe sie`cle*. Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis, ser. 2, vol. 4. Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1949.

Antonelli, Francis. *De inquisitione medico-legali super miraculis in causis beatificationis et canonizationis*. Rome: Pontificium Athenaeum Antonianum, 1962. Appel, Regis. "Cassian's *Discretio*—A Timeless Virtue." *American Benedictine Review* 17 (1966): 20–29.

Archibald, Elizabeth. *Incest and the Medieval Imagination*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.

Arnold, John. *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

Astell, Ann. "Translating Job as Female." In *Translation Theory and Practice in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jeanette Beer, 59–69. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, 1997.

Baldwin, John. "The Intellectual Preparation for the Canon of 1215 against Ordeals." *Speculum* 36 (1961): 613–36.

———. *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and His Circle*. 2 vols. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1970.

Bardy, Gustave. "Discernement des esprits: II. Chez les pe`res." *DS*, vol. 3, cols.

1247–54.

Bartlett, Robert. *Trial by Fire and Water: The Medieval Judicial Ordeal*. Oxford:
Clarendon, 1986.
Bériou, Nicole. “Autour de Latran IV (1215): la naissance de la confession moderne et sa diffusion.” In *Pratiques de la confession: des P[egrave]res du désert [agrave] Vatican II. Quinze études d’histoire*, Groupe de la Bussie`re, 73–92. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1983.
——. “La confession dans les écrits théologiques et pastorauxdu XIIIe sie`cle:
médication de l’ â me ou démarche judiciare?” In *Aveu*, 261–82.
Berlioz, Jacques. “Les ordalies dans les *exempla* de la confession.” In *Aveu*, 315–40.
——. “ ‘Quand dire c’est faire dire’: exempla et confession chez Etienne de Bourbon (d.v. 1261).” In *Faire Croire*, 67–85.
——. *Tuezles tous, Dieu reconna î tra les siens: le massacre de Béziers (22 juillet 1209) et la croisade contre les Albigeois vus par Césaire de Heisterbach*. Portet-sur-Garonne: Loubati[egrave]res, 1994.
Bernard, Antoine. *La Sépulture en droit canonique*. Paris: Editions Doman-Montcrestien, 1933.
Blamires, Alcuin. *The Case for Women in Medieval Culture*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
Blomme, Robert. *La Doctrine du péchédans les écoles théologiques de la premie`re moitiédu XIIe sie`cle*. Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1958.
Blumenfeld-Kosinski, Renate. “Constance de Rabastens: Politics and Visionary Experience in the Time of the Great Schism.” *Mystics Quarterly* 25 (1999):
147–68.
Boler, John. “Intuitive and Abstractive Cognition.” In *Cambridge History of Late Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Norman Kretzmann et al, 460–78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
Bolton, Brenda. “*Mulieres sanctae*.” In *Women in Medieval Society*, ed. Susan Stuard, 141–58. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1976.
Bonney, Fran ç oise. “Jugement de Gerson sur deuxex périences de la vie mystique de son époque: les visions d’Ermine et de Jeanne d’Arc.” In *Actes du 95e congr[egrave]s national des Sociétés Savantes, Reims 1970*, 2:187–95. Paris: Bibliothe`que Nationale, 1974.
Bornstein, Daniel. “Violenza al corpo di una santa: fra agiografia e pornografia.
A proposito di Douceline di Digne.” *Quaderni medievali* 39 (1995): 31–46.
Boureau, Alain. *The Myth of Pope Joan*. Trans. Lydia Cochrane. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Boyle, Leonard. *Pastoral Care, Clerical Education and Canon Law, 1200–1400*. London: Variorum, 1981.

———.*The Setting of the "Summa Theologicae" of Saint Thomas*. Etienne Gilson series, 5. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1982.

Braeckmans, Louis. *Confession et communion au Moyen Age et au Concile de Trente*. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1971.

Brooks, Peter. *Troubling Confessions: Speaking Guilt in Law and Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Brown, D. Catherine. *Pastor and Laity in the Theology of Jean Gerson*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Brown, Elizabeth. "Death and the Human Body in the Later Middle Ages: The Legislation of Boniface VIII on the Division of the Corpse." *Viator* 12 (1981):

221–70.

Brown, Judith. *Immodest Acts: The Life of a Lesbian Nun in Renaissance Italy*.

New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Brown, Peter. "Eastern and Western Christendom in Late Antiquity: A Parting of the Ways." In *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity*, 166–95. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982.

———. "Society and the Supernatural: A Medieval Change." In ibid., 302–32.

Brundage, James. "Widows as Disadvantaged Persons in Medieval Canon Law."

In *Upon My Husband's Death:Widows in the Literature and Histories of Medieval Europe*, ed. Helen Mirren, 193–206. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. "Bodily Miracles and the Resurrection of the Body in the High Middle Ages." In *Belief in History: Innovative Approaches to European and American Religion*, ed. Thomas Kselman, 68–106. Notre Dame, Ind.:

University of Notre Dame Press, 1991.

———. *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion*. New York: Zone Books, 1991.

———. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987.

———. *Metamorphosis and Identity*. New York: Zone Books, 2001.

———. *The Resurrection of the Body*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

———. "Violent Imagery in Late Medieval Piety." *German Historical*

Institute 30 (2002): 3–36.

——. “The Woman with the Pearl Necklace.” *Common Knowledge* 8 (2002):

280–83.

Caiger, B. J. “Doctrine and Discipline in the Church of Jean Gerson.” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 41 (1990): 389–407.

Cazenave, Annie. “Aveu et Contrition: Manuels de confesseurs et interrogatoires d’inquisition en Languedoc et en Catalogne (XIIIe–XIVe sie`cles).” In *La Piétépopulaire au Moyen Age*, 333–52. Actes du 99e congre`s national des Sociétés Savantes, Besan ç on, 1974. Paris: Bibliothe`que Nationale, 1977.

Chiffoleau, Jacques. “Sur la pratique et la conjoncture de l’aveu judiciare en France du XIIIe au XVe sie`cle.” In *Aveu*, 341–80.

Christian, William. *Apparitions in Late Medieval Spain*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Coakley, John. “Friars as Confidants of Holy Women in Medieval Dominican Hagiography.” In *Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe*, ed. Renate Blumen-feld-Kosinski and Timea Szell, 222–46. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991.

——. “Gender and the Authority of Friars: The Significance of HolyWomen for Thirteenth-Century Franciscans and Dominicans.” *Church History* 60 (1991):

445–60.

Colavechio, Xavier. *Erroneous Conscience and Obligations: A Study of the Teaching from the Summa Halesiana, Saint Bonaventure, Saint Albert the Great, and Thomas Aquinas*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1961.

Colledge, Eric. “*Epistola solitarii ad reges*: Alphonse of Pecha as Organizer of Birgittine and Urbanist Propaganda.” *Mediaeval Studies* 18 (1956): 19–49.

Combes, André. *Essai sur la critique de Ruysbroeck par Gerson*. 2 vols. Paris:

Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1945–48.

Congar, Yves. “Clerus et lai ö au point de vue de la culture au Moyen Age: ‘laicus’ = sans lettres.” In *Studia mediaevalia et mariologica P. Carolo Balic OFM septuagesimum explenti annum dictata*, 309–32. Rome: Antonianum, 1971.

Connolly, James. *Jean Gerson: Reformer and Mystic*. Louvain: Librairie Universitaire, 1928.

Courtenay,William. “Curers of Body and Soul: Medical Doctors as Theologians.”

In *Religion and Medicine in the Middle Ages*, ed. Peter Biller and Joseph Ziegler, 69–75. Woodbridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press in conjunction with Boydell and Brewer, 2001.

——. “Erfurt CA 127 and the Censured Articles of Mirecourt and Autrecourt.”

In *Die Bibliotheca Amploniana: Ihre Bedeutung im Spannungsfeld von Aristotelismus, Nominalismus und Humanismus*, ed. Andreas Speer, 341–52. Berlin:

Walter de Gruyter, 1995.

——. “Inquiry and Inquisition: Academic Freedom in Medieval Universities.”

Church History 58 (1989): 168–81.

——. “John of Mirecourt and Gregory of Rimini on Whether God Can Undo the Past.” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 39 (1972): 224–56; 40 (1973): 147–74.

——. “The Reception of Ockham’s Thought at the University of Paris.” In Kaluza and Vignaux, *Preuve et raisons*, 43–55.

——. “The Registers of the University of Paris and the Statutes against Scientia Occiamica.” *Vivarium* 1 (1991): 13–49.

——. “Was There an Ockhamist School?” In *Philosophies and Learning: Universities in the Middle Ages*, ed. Maarten Hoenen et al., 263–92. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

D’Alatri, Mariano. “Culto dei santi ed eretici in Italia nei secoli XII e XIII.” *Collectanea Franciscana* 45 (1975): 85–104.

——. “L’eresia nella Cronica di Fra Salimbene.” *Collectanea Franciscana* 37 (1967): 366–73.

Daniel, E. Randolph. “Exodus and Exile: Joachim of Fiore’s Apocalyptic Scenario.” In *Last Things: Death and the Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Caroline Walker Bynum and Paul Freedman, 124–39. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

De Certeau, Michel. *The Mystic Fable*. Vol. 1, *The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Trans. Michael Smith. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Delcourt, Marie. “Le complexe de Diane dans l’hagiographie chrétienne.” *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 143 (1958): 18–28.

Delehaye, Hippolyte. *Legends of the Saints*. Trans. Donald Attwater. New York:

Fordham University Press, 1962.

——. *Sanctus: Essai sur le culte de saints dans l’antiquité*. Subsidia Hagiographica, 17. Brussels: Bollandists, 1927.

Delooz, Pierre. “Towards a Sociological Study of Canonized Sainthood.” In *Saints and Their Cults*, ed. StephenWilson, 189–216. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Derrida, Jacques. *Given Time: 1. Counterfeit Money*. Trans. Peggy Kamuf. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Devic, Cl., and J. Vaiss[egrave]te. *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, Vol. 8. Toulouse: Privat, 1879.

Diehl, Peter. “Overcoming Reluctance to Prosecute Heresy in Thirteenth-Century Italy.” In *Christendom and Its Discontents: Exclusion, Persecution, and Rebellion, 1000–1500*, ed. Scott Waugh and Peter Diehl, 47–66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Dinzelbacher, Peter. *Heilige oder Hexen? Schicksale auffa ö lliger Frauen in Mittelalter und Fru ö hneuzeit*. Munich: Artemis and Winkler, 1995.

D’Izarny, Raymond. “Mariage et consécration virginale au IVe sie`cle.” *La Vie spirituelle* supp. 6 (1953): 92–118.

Dondaine, Antoine. “Le manuel de l’inquisiteur (1230–1330).” *AFP* 17 (1947):

85–194.

——.“Saint Pierre Martyr.” *AFP* 23 (1953): 66–162.

Dor, Juliette, et al., eds. *New Trends in Feminine Spirituality: The Holy Women of Li[egrave]ge and Their Impact*. Brussels: Brepols, 1999.

Dossat, Yves. “Le ‘bu û cher de Montségur’ et les bu û chers de l’inquisition.” *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 6 (1971): 361–78.

——. *Les Crises de l’Inquisition Toulousaine au XIIIe sie`cle (1233–73)*. Boudeaux: Imprimerie Be`ire, 1959.

——. “Le massacre d’Avignonet.” *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 6 (1971): 343–59.

——. “Le plus ancien manuel de l’inquisition méridionale: le *Processus inquisitionis (1248–1249*).” *Bulletin philologique et historique, du comitédes travaux historiques et scientifiques*, année 1948, pp. 33–37.

——. “La répression de l’hérésie par les év ê ques.” *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 6 (1971): 217–51.

Douais, Célestin. “La formule communicatio bonorum vivorum consilio des sentences inquisitoriales.” *Le Moyen Age*, ser. 2,2, 12 (1898): 157–92.

——. *L’Inquisition: ses origines—sa procédure*. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1906.

——. “Saint Raymond de PeÑafort et les hérétiques: Directoire [agrave] l’usage des inquisiteurs aragonais, 1242.” *Le Moyen Age* 12 (1899): 305–25.

Dronke, Peter.*WomenWriters of the Middle Ages: A Critical Study of Texts from Perpetua (*] 203) to Marguerite Porete (] 1310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

DuBois, Page. *Torture and Truth*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Duval, André. “Le Concile de Trente et la confession.” *La Maison-Dieu* 118 (1974): 131–80.

Elliott, Dyan. “Authorizing a Life: The Collaboration of Dorothea of Montau and John Marienwerder.” In *Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and Their Interpreters*, ed. Catherine Mooney, 168–91. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.

——.“*Dominae* or *Dominatae*? Female Mystics and the Trauma of Textuality.”

In*Women, Marriage, and Family in Medieval Christendom: Essays in Memory of Michael M. Sheehan, C.S.B.*, ed. Constance Rousseau and Joel Rosenthal, 47–77. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, 1998.

——. “Dress as Mediator between Inner and Outer Self: The Pious Matron of the High and Later Middle Ages.” *Mediaeval Studies* 53 (1991): 279–308.

——. *Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.

——. “The Physiology of Rapture and Female Spirituality.” In *Medieval Theology and the Natural Body*, ed. Peter Biller and Alastair Minnis, 141–73.Wood-bridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell and Brewer, 1997.

——. “Seeing Double: John Gerson, the Discernment of Spirits, and Joan of Arc.” *American Historical Review* 107 (2002): 26–54.

——. *Spiritual Marriage: Sexual Abstinence in Medieval Wedlock*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993.

——. “True Presence/False Christ: Antinomies of Embodiment in Medieval Spirituality.” *Mediaeval Studies* 64 (2002): 241–65.

——.“Women and Confession: From Empowerment to Pathology.” In *Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages*, ed. Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski, 31–51. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Enders, Jody. “The Theater of Scholastic Erudition.” *Comparative Drama* 27 (1993): 341–63.

Erler, Mary. “English Vowed Women at the End of the Middle Ages.” *Mediaeval Studies* 57 (1995): 155–204.

Esmein, Adhémar. *A History of Continental Criminal Procedure with Special Reference to France*. Trans. John Simpson. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1913.

Farmer, Sharon. “Persuasive Voices: Clerical Images of Medieval Wives.” *Speculum* 61 (1986): 517–43.

Foreville, Raymonde. “Les statuts synodauxet le renouveau pastoral du XIIIe sie`cle dans le Midi de la France.” *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 6 (1971): 119–50.

Fo ö rg, Ludwig. *Die Ketzerverfolgung in Deutschland unter Gregor IX*. Historische Studien, vol. 218. Berlin: Emil Ebering, 1932.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith.

London: Routledge, 1972.

——. *The History of Sexuality*. Vol. 1, *An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley.

New York: Vintage Books, 1980.
Fraioli, Deborah. *Joan of Arc: The Early Debate*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 2000.
——. "The Literary Image of Joan of Arc: Prior Influences." *Speculum* 56 (1981): 811–30.
Francq, H. G. "Jean Gerson's Theological Treatise and Other Memoirs in Defence of Joan of Arc." *Revue de l'Universitéd'Ottawa* 41 (1971): 58–80.
Friedlander, Alan. *The Hammer of the Inquisitors: Brother Bernard Délicieux and the Struggle against the Inquisition in Fourteenth-Century France*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
Frugoni, Chiara. "Female Mystics, Visions, and Iconography." In *Women and Religion in Medieval and Renaissance Italy*, ed. Daniel Bornstein and Roberto Rusconi, trans. Margery Schneider, 130–64. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
Funk, Philipp. *Jakob von Vitry: Leben und Werke*. Leipzig and Berlin: Walter Goetz, 1909.
Genest, Jean-Fran ç ois. "Pierre de Ceffons et l'hypothe`se du Dieu Trompeur." In Kaluza and Vigneaux, *Preuve et raisons*, 198–214.
Gilkær, Hans. *The Political Ideas of St. Birgitta and Her Spanish Confessor, Alfonso Pecha*. Trans. Michael Cain. Odense University Studies in History and Social Sciences, vol. 163. Odense: Odense University Press, 1993.
Given, James. *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline, and Resistance in Languedoc*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1997.
Glorieux, Palémon. "Le Chancelier Gerson et la réforme de l'enseignement." In *Mélanges offerts a` Etienne Gilson*, 285–98. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1959.
——. "L'enseignement au Moyen Age." *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et litte è raire du Moyen Age* 43 (1968): 65–186.
——. *La Littérature quodlibétique de 1260 [agrave] 1320*. 2 vols. Vol 1: Le Saulchoir, Kain: Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques, 1925. Vol. 2: Paris:
Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1935.
——. "Saint Joseph dans l'oeuvre de Gerson." *Cahiers de josépholog*ie 19 (1971): 414–28.
——."La vie et les oeuvres de Gerson: essai chronologique." *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 25–26 (1950–51): 149–92.
Goodich, Michael. "The Politics of Canonization in the Thirteenth Century: Lay and Mendicant Saints." In *Saints and Their Cults*, ed. StephenWilson, 169–88.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
Gouguenheim, Sylvain. *La Sybille du Rhin: Hildegarde de Bingen,*

abbesse et prophe è tesse rhénane. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1996.

Gregory, Tullio. “Dio ingannatore e genio maligno: nota in margine alle *Meditationes* di Descartes.” *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana* 53 (1974): 477–516. ——.“La tromperie divine.” In Kaluza and Vignaux, *Preuve et raisons*, 187–95.

Grundmann, Herbert. *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages*. Trans. S. Rowan.

Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995.

Gy, Pierre-Marie. “Les bases de la pénitence moderne.” *La Maison-Dieu* 117 (1974): 63–85.

——. “Les définitions de la confession apre`s le quatrie`me concile du Latran.”

In *Aveu*, 283–312.

——.“Le précepte de la confession annuelle et la nécessitéde la confession.”

Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques 63 (1979): 529–47.

——. “Le précepte de la confession annuelle (Latran IV, c. 21) et la détection des hérétiques: S. Bonaventure et S. Thomas contre S. Raymond de PeÑafort.”

Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques 58 (1974): 444–50.

Hamburger, Jeffrey. *Nuns as Artists: The Visual Culture of a Medieval Convent*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997.

Haskins, Charles Homer. “Robert le Bougre and the Beginnings of the Inquisition in Northern France.” In *Studies in Mediaeval Culture*, 193–244. Oxford:

Clarendon, 1929.

Helmholz, Richard. *The Spirit of Classical Canon Law*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996.

Herlihy, David. *Medieval Households*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.

Hollywood, Amy. “Inside Out: Beatrice of Nazareth and Her Hagiographer.” In *Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and Their Interpreters*, ed. Catherine Mooney, 78–98. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.

——. *The Soul as VirginWife: Mechtild of Magdeburg, Marguerite Porete, and Meister Eckhart*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995.

Huneycutt, Lois. “Intercession and the High Medieval Queen: The Esther Topos.”

In *The Power of theWeak: Studies on MedievalWomen*, ed. Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth MacLean, 126–46. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995.

Jacquart, Danielle, and Claude Thomasset. *Sexuality and Medicine in the Middle Ages*. Trans. M. Adamson. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Kaltner, Balthasar. *Konrad von Marburg und die Inquisition in Deutschland*. Prague: F. Tempsky, 1882.

Kaluza, Zénon. "Les écoles doctrinales." In *Les Querelles doctrinales a` Paris:*

Nominalistes et Réalistes aux confins du XIVe et du XVe sie`cles, 13–34. Bergamo: Pierluigi Lubrina, 1988.

——. "Gerson et les querelles doctrinales." In ibid., 35–86.

Kaluza, Zénon, and Paul Vignaux, eds. *Preuve et raisons a` l'Universitéde Paris:*

Logique, ontologie, et théologie au XIVe sie`cle. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1984.

Karras, Ruth. *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.

Kelly, Henry Ansgar. "Inquisition and the Prosecution of Heresy: Misconceptions and Abuses." *Church History* 58 (1989): 439–51.

Kieckhefer, Richard. "The Holy and the Unholy: Sainthood, Witchcraft, and Magic in Late Medieval Europe." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 24 (1994): 335–85.

——.*Magic in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

——. "The Office of the Inquisition and Medieval Heresy: The Transition from Personal to Institutional Jurisdiction." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46 (1995): 36–61.

——. *The Repression of Heresy in Medieval Germany*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979.

——. *Unquiet Souls: Fourteenth-Century Saints and Their Religious Milieu*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Kleinberg, Aviad. *Prophets in Their Own Country: Living Saints and the Making of Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

——. "Proving Sanctity: Selection and Authentication of Saints in the Later Middle Ages." *Viator* 20 (1989): 183–205.

Koch, Joseph. "Der Prozess gegen den Magister Johannes de Polliaco und seine Vorgeschichte (1312–1321)." *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 5 (1933): 391–422.

Kowaleski, Maryanne, and Judith Bennett. "Crafts, Gilds, and Women in the Middle Ages: Fifty Years after Marian K. Dale." In *Sisters and Workers in the Middle Ages*, ed. Judith Bennett et al., 11–25. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Kuttner, Stephen. "Raymond of PeÑafort as Editor: The 'Decretales' and 'Constitutiones' of Gregory IX." *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law*,

n.s., 12 (1982):
65–80.
Lacan, Jacques. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book II*. Trans. Sylvana Tomaselli.
New York: Norton, 1992.
——. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Bk. VII: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis, 1959–1960*. Trans. Dennis Porter. New York: Norton, 1992.
Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
Lambert, Malcolm. *The Cathars*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
——. *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*. 2d ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
Lansing, Carol. *Power and Purity: Cathar Heresy in Medieval Italy*. New York:
Oxford University Press, 1998.
Laqueur, Thomas. *Making Sex: The Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
Lea, H. C. *A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*. 3 vols. London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1896.
——. *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*. 3 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1906.
——. *Superstition and Force: Essays on the Wager of Law—the Wager of Battle—the Ordeal—Torture*. 4th ed. Philadelphia: Lea Bros., 1892.
Legendre, Pierre. "*De confessis*: remarques sur le statut de la parole dans la premie` re scholastique." In *Aveu*, 401–8.
Le Goff, Jacques. *The Birth of Purgatory*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, 1984.
——. *The Medieval Imagination*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
——. *Your Money or Your Life: Economy and Religion in the Middle Ages*.
Trans. Patricia Ranum. New York: Zone Books, 1988.
Lerner, Robert. "The 'Angel of Philadelphia' in the Reign of Philip the Fair: The Case of Guiard of Cressonessart." In *Order and Innovation in the Middle Ages:*
Essays in Honor of Joseph R. Strayer, ed. W. Jordan and T. Ruiz, 343–64.
Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1972.
——. "Ecstatic Dissent." *Speculum* 67 (1992): 33–57.
——. *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972.

——. “The Image of Mixed Liquid in Late Medieval Mystical Thought.”
Church History 40 (1971): 397–411.
Lévy, Jean-Philippe. “La proble`me de la preuve dans les droits savants au Moyen Age.” *Recueils de la Sociétéde Jean Bodin* 17, 2 (1965): 137–67.
Lienhard, Joseph. “On ‘Discernment of Spirits’ in the Early Church.” *Theological Studies* 41 (1980): 505–29.
Little, Lester K. “Les techniques de la confession et la confession comme technique.” In *Faire Croire*, 87–99.
Lochrie, Karma. *Margery Kempe and Translations of the Flesh* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991.
Lottin, Odon. *Psychologie et morale aux XIIe et XIIIe sie`cles*. 6 vols. in 8. Louvain: Abbaye du Mont César, 1948–60.
Love, Wendy. “Free Spirits, Presumptuous Women, and False Prophets: The Discernment of Spirits in the Late Middle Ages.” Ph.D. diss., Divinity School, University of Chicago, 2002.
McDonnell, Ernest. *The Beguines and Beghards in Medieval Culture*. New York:
Octagon, 1969.
McGuire, Brian. “Education, Confession, and Pious Fraud: Jean Gerson and a Late Medieval Change.” *American Benedictine Review* 47 (1996): 310–38.
——. “Jean Gerson and the End of Spiritual Friendship: Dilemmas of Conscience.” In *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Julian Halsedine, 230–50.
Thrupp, UK: Sutton, 1999.
——. “Late Medieval Care and the Control of Women: Jean Gerson and His Sisters.” *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 92 (1997): 5–36.
McNamara, Jo Ann. “The Need to Give: Suffering and Female Sanctity in the Middle Ages.” In Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Szell, *Images of Sainthood*, 199–221.
——. “The Rhetoric of Orthodoxy: Clerical Authority and Female Innovation in the Struggle with Heresy.” In *Maps of Flesh and Light: The Religious Experience of Medieval Women Mystics*, ed. Ulrike Wiethaus, 9–27. Syracuse, N.Y.:
Syracuse University Press, 1993.
McVaugh, Michael. “Moments of Inflection: The Careers of Arnau of Vilanova.”
In Biller and Ziegler, *Religion and Medicine*, 47–68.
Maissoneuve, Henri. *Etudes sur les origines de l’Inquisition*. 2d ed. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1960.
Manselli, Raoul. “De la ‘persuasio’ a` la ‘coercitio.’ ” *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 6 (1971): 175–97.

——.“Il miracolo e i catari.” *Bollettino della Societa` di Studi Valdesi* 97 (1976):
15–19.
Marche, A. Lecoy de la. “Une fausse Jeanne d’Arc.” *Revue des questions historiques* 10 (1871): 562–82.
Martini[egrave]re, Jules de La. “Fr[egrave]re Richard et Jeanne d’Arc a` Orléans: mars–juillet 1430.” *Le Moyen Age*, ser. 3, 5 (1934): 189–98.
May, Karl Hermann. “Zur Geschicte Konrads von Marburg.” *Hessisches Jahrbuch fu ö r Landesgeschichte* 1 (1951): 87–109.
Mazzoni, Cristina. *Saint Hysteria: Neurosis, Mysticism, and Gender in European Culture*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996.
Meersseman, G. “Les fre`res pr ê cheurs et mouvement dévot en Flandre au XIIIe sie`cle.” *AFP* 18 (1948): 69–105.
Mens, A. “L’Ombrie italienne et l’Ombrie braban ç onne: Deuxcourants religieux paralle`les d’inspiration commune.” *Etudes Franciscaines*, annual supplement, 17 (1967): 14–47.
Merkle, Gertrude. “Martin Le Franc’s Commentary on Jean Gerson’s Treatise on Joan of Arc.” In *Fresh Verdicts on Joan of Arc*, ed. Bonnie Wheeler and Charles Wood, 177–88. New York: Garland, 1996.
Michaud-Quantin, Pierre. “A propros des premie`res *Summae confessorum*.” *Re-cherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 26 (1959): 264–306.
——. “La conscience individuelle et ses droits chez les moralistes de la fin du Moyen-Age.” In *Universalismus und Partikularismus im Mittelalter*, ed. Paul Wilpert, 42–55. Miscellanea mediaevalis, 5. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968.
——. *Sommes de casuistique et manuels de confession du Moyen Age (XII–XVI sie`cles)*. Louvain: Nauwelaerts; Lille: Librairie Giard, 1962.
Mitri, A. *De figura juridica postularis in causis beatificationis et canonizationis*.
Rome and Paris: Desclée, 1962.
Moore, R. I. *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Power and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1987.
Morrall, John. *Gerson and the Great Schism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1960.
Morris, Bridget. *St. Birgitta of Sweden*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 1999.
Morris, Colin. *The Discovery of the Individual, 1050–1200*. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.
——. “*Judicium Dei*: The Social and Political Significance of the Ordeal in the Eleventh Century.” In *Church Society and Politics*, ed. Derek Baker, 95–111.
Studies in Church History, vol. 12. Oxford: Blackwell, 1975.

Muessig, Carolyn. “Les sermons de Jacques de Vitry sur les cathares.” *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 32 (1997): 69–83.

Mulchahey,M. Miche`le. *“First the Bow Is Bent in Study . . .”: Dominican Education before 1350*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1998.

Muraro, Luisa. *Guglielma e Maifreda: Storia di un’eresia femminista*. Milan: Tar-taruga, 1985.

Murray, Alexander. “Counselling in Medieval Confession.” In *Handling Sin: Confession in the Middle Ages*, ed. Peter Biller and Alastair Minnis, 63–77. University of York: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell and Brewer, 1998. Nardi, Bruno. *Soggetto et oggetto del conoscere nella filosofia antica e medievale*.

Rome: Ateneo, 1952.

Neel, Carol. “The Origins of the Beguines.” In Bennett et al., *Sisters and Workers*, 240–60.

Newman, Barbara. “Divine Power Made Perfect in Weakness: St. Hildegard on the Frail Sex.” In *Medieval Religious Women*, vol. 2, *Peaceweavers*, ed. John Nichols and Lillian Shank, 103–22. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1987.

——. *From Virile Woman to WomanChrist: Studies in Medieval Religion and Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.

——. *God and the Goddesses: Vision, Poetry, and Belief in the Middle Ages*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.

——. “Possessed by the Spirit: Devout Women, Demoniacs, and the Apostolic Life in the Thirteenth Century.” *Speculum* 73 (1998): 733–70.

——. *Sister of Wisdom: St. Hildegard’s Theology of the Feminine*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987.

Normore, Calvin. “Future Contingents.” In *Cambridge History of Late Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Norman Kretzmann et al., 358–82. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Oakley, Frances. “Gerson and d’Ailly: An Admonition.” *Speculum* 40 (1965):

74–83.

——. *The Political Thought of Pierre d’Ailly: The Voluntarist Tradition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

O’Reilly, Jennifer. “ ‘Candidus et Rubicundus’: An Image of Martyrdom in the ‘Lives’ of Thomas Becket.” *AB* 99 (1981): 303–14.

Owens, Joseph. “Faith, Ideas, Illumination, and Experience.” In *Cambridge History of Late Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Norman Kretzmann et al., 444–59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Ozment, Steven. *Homo Spiritualis: A Comparative Study of the Anthropology of Johannes Tauler, Jean Gerson, and Martin Luther in the Context of Their Theological Thought*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.

——. “The University and the Church: Patterns of Reform in Jean Gerson.”

Medievalia et Humanistica, n.s., 1 (1970): 111–26.

Paolini, Lorenzo. *L’Eresia a Bologna fra XIII e XIV secolo*. Vol. 1, *L’Eresia catara alla fine del Duecento*. Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, Studi storici, fasc. 93. Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, 1975.

——. “Gli ordini mendicanti e l’inquisizione: il ‘comportamento’ degli eretici e il giudizio sui frati.” *MEFRM* 89, 2 (1977): 695–709.

Park, Katherine. “The Criminal and Saintly Body: Autopsy and Dissection in Renaissance Italy.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 47 (1994): 1–33.

Parsons, John Carmi. “The Queen’s Intercession in Thirteenth-Century England.”

In Carpenter and MacLean, *The Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, 147–77.

Paul, Jacques. “Le prophétisme autour de Jeanne d’Arc et de sa mission.” In *Il profetismo gioachimita tra Quattrocento e Cinquecento*, Atti del III Congresso Internazionale di Studi Gioachimiti, S. Giovanni in Fiore, 17–21 settembre 1989, ed. Gian Luca Potesta` , 157–81. Geneva: Marietti, 1991.

Pegg, Mark. *The Corruption of Angels: The Great Inquisition of 1245–1246*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Peters, Edward. *Inquisition*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989.

——. *Torture*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1985.

Petroff, Elizabeth. *Body and Soul: Essays on Medieval Women and Mysticism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Peyronnet, Georges. “Gerson, Charles VII et Jeanne d’Arc: la propagande au service de la guerre.” *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 84, 1 (1989): 334–70.

Pouchelle, Marie-Christine. *The Body and Surgery in the Middle Ages*. Trans.

Rosemary Morris. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

Raabe, Augusta. “Discernment of Spirits in the Prologue to the *Rule* of Benedict.”

American Benedictine Review 23 (1972): 399–403.

Ranft, P. “The Concept of Witness in the Christian Tradition.” *Revue Bénédictine* 102 (1992): 9–23.

Reeves, Marjorie. *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.

Roisin, Simone. “L’efflorescence cistercienne et le courant féminin de piétéau XIIIe si[egrave]cle.” *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 39

(1943): 342–78.

——. *L'Hagiographie cistercienne dans la dioce`se de Li[egrrave]ge au XIIIe si[egrave]cle*. Louvain: Biblioth[egrave]que de l'Université, 1947.

——. "La méthode hagiographique de Thomas de Cantimpré." In *Miscellanea Historica in Honorem Alberti de Meyer*, 1:546–57. Louvain: Bibliothe`que de l'Université, 1946.

Rubin, Miri. *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

——. "Martyrdom in Late Medieval Europe." In *Martyrs and Martyrologies*, ed. Diana Wood, 153–83. Studies in Church History, vol. 30. Oxford: Black-well, 1993.

Rusconi, Roberto. "De la prédication a` la confession: transmission et contro ô le de mode`les de comportement au XIIIe sie`cle." In *Faire Croire*, 67–85.

Sahlin, Claire. *Birgitta of Sweden and the Voice of Prophecy*. Woodbridge, Suf-folk: Boydell, 2001.

Schiesari, Juliana. *The Gendering of Melancholia: Feminism, Psychoanalysis, and the Symbolics of Loss in Renaissance Literature*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Schmitt, Jean-Claude. *Ghosts in the Middle Ages: The Living and the Dead in Medieval Society*. Trans. Teresa Fagan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

——. *The Holy Greyhound: Guinefort, Healer of Children since the Thirteenth Century*. Trans. Martin Thom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. Schutte, Anne. *Aspiring Saints: Pretense of Holiness, Inquisition, and Gender in the Republic of Venice, 1618–1750*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Scott, Karen. " 'Io Catharina': Ecclesiastical Politics and Oral Culture in the Letters of Catherine of Siena." In *Dear Sister: Medieval Women and the Epistolatory Genre*, ed. Karen Cherewatuk and UlrikeWiethaus, 67–121. Philadelphia:

University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.

——. "Mystical Death, Bodily Death: Catherine of Siena and Raymond of Capua on the Mystic's Encounter with God." In Mooney, *Gendered Voices*, 136–67.

Shannon, Albert. "The Secrecy ofWitnesses in Inquisitorial Tribunals and in Contemporary Secular Criminal Trials." In *Essays in Medieval Life and Thought*, ed. John Mundy et al., 59–69. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

Simons, Walter. *Cities of Ladies: Beguine Communities in the Medieval Low Countries, 1200–1565*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

——. "Reading a Saint's Body: Rapture and Bodily Movement in the *Vitae* of Thirteenth-Century Beguines." In *Framing Medieval Bodies*, ed.

Sara Kay and Miri Rubin, 10–23. Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1994.

Simons,Walter, and J. E. Ziegler. “Phenomenal Religion in the Thirteenth Century and Its Image: Elisabeth of Spalbeek and the Passion Cult.” In *Women in the Church*, ed. W. J. Sheils and Diana Wood, 117–26. Studies in Church History, vol. 27. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.

Smalley, Beryl. *The Becket Conflict and the Schools: A Study of Intellectuals in Politics*. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1973.

Smoller, Laura. *History, Prophecy, and the Stars: The Christian Astrology of Pierre d’Ailly, 1350–1420*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Soliman, Donato. *Il ministero della confessione nella legislazione dei Frati Minori*. Studi e Testi Francescani, no. 28. Rome: Edizione Francescane, 1964.

Stargardt, Ute. “Male Clerical Authority in the Spiritual (Auto)biographies of Medieval Holy Women.” In*Women as Protagonists and Poets in the German Middle Ages*, ed. Albrecht Classen, 209–38. Go ö ppingen: Kummerle, 1991.

——. “The Political and Social Backgrounds of the Canonization of Dorothea von Montau.” *Mystics Quarterly* 11 (1985): 107–222.

Strohm, Paul. *England’s Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

——. *Hochon’s Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Stroick, Clemens. *Heinrich von Friemar*. Freiburg: Herder, 1954.

Sullivan, Karen. *The Interrogations of Joan of Arc*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Sweetman, Robert. “Christine of Saint-Trond’s Preaching Apostolate: Hagiographical Method Revisited.” *Vox Benedictina* 9 (1992): 67–97.

Teetaert, Amédée. *La Confession aux laïques dans l’église latine depuis le VIIIe jusqu’au XIVe sie`cle*. Wetteren: J. de Meester; Bruges: Ch. Beyaert; Paris: J.

Gabalda, 1926.

——.“La doctrine pénitentielle de Saint Raymond de Penyafort, O.P.” *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia* 5 (1929): 121–82.

——. “La *Summa de poenitentia* de Saint Raymond de Penyafort.” *Ephemerides Theologiae Lovaniensis* 5 (1928): 49–72.

Tentler, Thomas. *Sin and Confession on the Eve of the Reformation*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1977.

Thijssen, J.M.M.H. *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris*. Philadelphia:

University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998.

Toynbee, Margaret. *S. Louis of Toulouse and the Process of*

Canonisation in the Fourteenth Century. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1929.

Trexler, Richard. “The Stigmatized Body of Francis of Assisi: Conceived, Processed, and Disappeared.” In *Fro ö mmigkeit im Mittelalter: Politisch-soziale Kontexte, visuelle Praxis, ko ö rperliche Ausdrucksformen*, ed. Klaus Schreiner and Marc Mu ö nz, 463–97. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2002.

Tubach, Frederic. *Index Exemplorum: A Handbook of Medieval Religious Tales*.

Folklore Fellows Communications, no. 204. Helsinki: Suodmalainen Tiedeakatemia, Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1969.

Ullmann, Walter. “Some Medieval Principles of Criminal Procedure.” *Juridical Review* 59 (1947): 1–28.

Valois, Noeïl. *Guillaume d’Auvergne, ev ê que de Paris (1228–1249): sa vie et ses ouvrages*. Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1880.

——. “Jeanne d’Arc et la prophétie de Marie Robine.” In *Mélanges Paul Fabre:*

Etudes d’histoire du Moyen Age, 452–67. Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1902.

——. “Les révélations de Constance de Rabastens et le schisme d’occident (1384–86).” *Annales du Midi* 8 (1896): 241–78.

Van Caenegem, R. C. “Methods of Proof in Western Medieval Law.” *Mededelingen van Koninklijke Academie voorWetenschappen Letteren en Schone Kunsten van Belgieï, Academiae Analecta* 45, 3 (1983): 85–127.

——. “La preuve dans l’ancien Belge des origines a` la fin du XVIIIe sie`cle.”

Recueils de la Sociétéde Jean Bodin 17, 2 (1965): 375–430.

Vauchez, André. “L’Image vivante: Quelques réflexions sur les fonctions des repre è sentations iconographiques dans le domaine religieuxen Occident aux derniers sie`cles du Moyen Age.” In *Biedni i Bogaci: Studia z dziejo è w spo3eczen é stwa i kultury ofiarowane Bronis3awowi Geremkowi w szes è c è dziesia² ta² rocznice² urodzin*, 231–41. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1992.

——. “Jeanne d’Arc et le prophétisme féminin des XIVe et XVe si[egrave]cles.” In *Jeanne d’Arc: une époque, un rayonnement*, 159–168. Colloque d’histoire mé diéval, Orléans—Octobre 1979. Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1982.

——. *The Laity in the Middle Ages: Religious Beliefs and Devotional Practices*.

Trans. Margery Schneider. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.

——.“Les pouvoirs informels dans l’Eglise auxderniers sie`cles du Moyen Age:

visionnaires, prophe`tes et mystiques.” *MEFRM* 96 (1984): 281–93.

——. “Proselytisme et action antihérétique en milieu feminin au XIIIe sie`cle: la *Vie de Marie d’Oignies* (d. 1213) par Jacques de Vitry.” In *Propagande et contre- propagande religieuses*, ed. Jacques Marx, 95–110. Brussels: Editions de l’Universitaire, 1987.

——.*Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*. Trans. Jean Birrell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

——. “Sainte Brigitte de Sue`de et Sainte Catherine de Sienne: le mystique et l’Eglise auxderniers si[egrave]cles du Moyen Age.” In *Temi e problemi nella mistica femminile Trecento*, 14–17 ottobre Convegni del Centro di studi sulla spiritualita` medievale, Universita` degli studi di Perugia, 229–48. Todi: Presso l’accademia Tudertina, 1983.

——. “Les stigmates de Saint Fran ç ois et leurs detracteurs.” *MEFRM* 80 (1968): 595–625.

Vicaire, M.-H. “ ‘Persequutor Hereticorum’ ou les ‘Persécutions’ de Saint Dominique.” *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 6 (1971): 75–84.

Voaden, Rosalynn. *God’s Words,Women’s Voices: The Discernment of Spirits in the Writing of Late-Medieval Women Visionaries*. Woodbridge, Suffolk:

Boydell, 1999.

Warner, Marina. *Joan of Arc: The Image of Female Heroism*. London: George Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1981.

Warren, Nancy. *Spiritual Economies: Female Monasticism in Later Medieval England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

Wayman, Dorothy. “The Chancellor and Jeanne d’Arc, February–July, A.D.

1429.” *Franciscan Studies* 18 (1957): 273–305.

Weber, Alison. “Between Ecstasy and Exorcism: Religious Negotiation in Sixteenth-Century Spain.” *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 23 (1993):

221–34.

Wessley, Stephen. “Enthusiasm and Heresy in the Year 1300: Guglielma of Milan, Armanno Pungilupo of Ferrara and Gerard Segarelli.” Ph.D. diss. Columbia University, 1976.

——. “The Thirteenth-Century Guglielmites: Salvation through Women.” In *Medieval Women*, ed. Derek Baker, 289–303. Studies in Church History, subs.

ser., vol. 1. Oxford: Blackwell, 1978.

Wippel, J. F. “Quodlibetal Questions, Chiefly in Theological Faculties.” In *Les Questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les facultés de théologie, de droit et de médecine*, ed. B. C. Bazan et al., 153–222. Typologie des sources du Moyen Age Occidental, 44–45. Turnhout: Brepols, 1985.

Wood, Charles. *Joan of Arc and Richard III: Sex, Saints, and Government in the Middle Ages*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Zarri, Gabrielle, ed. *Finzione e santita` tra medioevo ed eta` moderna*. Turin: Rosenberg and Sellier, 1991.

——. *Le sante vive: cultura e religiosit[agrave] femminile nella prima et[agrave] moderna*. Turin: Rosenberg and Sellier, 1990.

Ziegler, Joseph. *Medicine and Religion, c. 1300: The Case of Arnau of Vilanova*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Žižek, Slavoj. *Enjoy Your Symptom! Jacques Lacan in Hollywood and Out*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

——. *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan through Popular Culture*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991.

——. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London, Verso Books, 1989.

INDEX

** signifies an individual who has been a defendant or witness in proceedings against heretics*
*** signifies an individual with mystical claims*

Abelard, Peter (philosopher, theologian, Benedictine monk), 9n, 13, 14
absolution, 14, 214
accusation/denunciation, 18, 36, 40, 43, 103–4, 124, 143. *See also* incrimination; proof
afterlife, 58, 59, 78. *See also* purgatory
Aicradus (Aichard, abbot of Jumièges), 69, 69n
*Alaidis (informant to Conrad of Marburg), 103
Alan of Lille (theologian), 11n, 24n
Albert the Great (Dominican theologian), 20, 207, 218, 237, 238, 239
*Albert the Wine Carrier, 158
Albi, 170, 172, 173
Albigensian Crusade, 52, 59, 61, 62–63, 164. *See also* Crusades
Albrandino (priest of Stommeln), 184
Albric of Trois-Fontaines (Cistercian chronicler), 63n
Aldobrandinus of Ferrara (Dominican inquisitor), 151
*Alegrantia (wife of Johannes of Perugia), 161
Alexander III (pope), 128
**Alpais of Sens, 190n
Alphonse of Pecha (bishop of Jaén), 277, 289
Amelot of Chaumont (recipient of miracle), 134
*Amissat of Narbonne, 177
*Amorosia, Jacoba, of Lodève, 177
Andrew II (king of Hungary) 86
**Angela of Foligno (tertiary Franciscan), 180
angels, 195, 240–41, 251–52, 253
Annals of Worms, 97, 104, 110
Antichrist, 260, 266
Antigone, 72, 164, 175
Antoninus of Florence (archbishop and theologian), 34, 39, 47, 48, 132n, 217n
Aquinas, Thomas (Dominican theologian): on absolution, 14; on confession, 10n, 20; on demons, 238; on erroneous conscience, 241–42, 243; on the eucharist, 16–17; on the eucharist-confession link, 15; on fraternal correction, 40; and Gerson, 277n; and the God-husband analogy, 92; on heresy, 35, 69; on Job, 108; and John of Freiburg, 36; on justice, 218; on knowing as God vs. man, 42; on ordeal, 16–17, 18; and Raymond of Peñafort, 23n; on a saint in hell, 128, 142; on the seal of confession, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39–40
Aristotle, 204, 206, 286
*Armannus Punzilupus of Ferrara, 150–52, 160, 163, 193, 299
*Arnaldus de Vernhola of Pamiers, 32n
Arnaud (abbot of Citeaux and a leader of the Albigensian Crusade), 164
Arnaud, Bernardus, of Lodève, 174
Arnau of Vilanova (Franciscan doctor-theologian), 204n
asceticism: and Conrad of Marburg, 106; in Elisabeth and Conrad's relationship, 94; of female mystics vs. Cathars, 63; Gerson on, 268; and Guglielma, 153; and heresy, 50; in John Climacus, 113; and martyrdom, 63; of Mary of Oignies, 50, 51–52, 64, 80; and women, 268. *See also* food
*Astruga of Lodève, 177
*Auda de Fagia (wife of Guillelmus Fabri de Muro Veteri of Montaillou), 223–26, 227, 228–29, 298–99
Augustine of Hippo (bishop and church father), 23, 205, 215, 268, 269
Avicenna, 167; *Canon of Medicine*, 204

Bartholomeus of Pisa (Dominican theologian), 39n, 40

Basin, Bernard (canon and theologian), 211
**Beatrice of Nazareth (Cistercian nun), 191n
Becket, Thomas (archbishop of Canterbury), 64
Beguines, 47–84, 187; and Cathars, 51; confessional practices of, 4–5, 48–49, 51–52, 54; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 85, 100; and the eucharist, 50–51; Gilbert of Tournai on, 189; and Gregory IX, 90; and heresy, 59; and judgment, 77; as living martyrs, 64–66, 298; and Nider, 199; of Nivelles, 84; and purgatory, 77; as living relics, 70–73; and the rhetoric of persecution, 64–65; and Rixendis, 201; and scrupulosity, 216; and Sybil, 194, 196. *See also* female mystics; female spirituality
Beguins (Fraticelli), 173–78, 222, 235, 244, 299. *See also* Spiritual Franciscans
Benedict XII. *See* Fournier, James
**Berengaria of Narbonne, 175
Berengar of Saint Affrique (bishop's *officialis*), 164, 165, 186, 188
Bériou, Nicole, 19–20
Berlioz, Jacques, 15n
Bernard (Dominican papal penitentiary), 56, 56n, 98, 99
Bernardino of Siena (Franciscan reformer), 257n
**Bernard of Clairvaux, Saint (Cistercian abbot and theologian), 55, 256, 277n
**Beutler, Magdalena (Clarissan nun), 197–200, 202
bishop: and canonization, 130, 138, 140; and heretical inquisition, 122–23, 133, 137; and Raymond of Peñafort, 27. *See also* clergy
Black Death, 267
Boccaccio, Giovanni, 193, 194
body: of Alpaïs of Sens, 190n; animation of the, 70; autopsy of the, 146n; of Clare of Montefalco, 146, 147–48, 186, 190, 191; concupiscence of the, 209; corruption of the, 70, 100; of Dorothea of Montau, 148; of Elena d'Oglio, 145, 146; elevation of the, 182, 183; of Elisabeth of Hungary, 100, 157; and evidence of the, 5, 81; and female spirituality, 2, 72, 73, 79, 144, 182–84, 300; and Gerson, 266; of Guglielma, 163; of holy living vs. holy dead, 71; of Lucia of Narni, 194; of Lydwine of Schiedam, 189–91; and martyrdom, 67–68; of Mary of Oignies, 52; and miracles, 144, 252; of Olivi, 163; as proof, 5, 81, 144, 191, 192, 262–63; and sanctity, 298; and signs of demonic possession, 253–54; and spiritual discernment, 259; and the stigmata of Francis of Assisi, 167; and suffering. *See also* humors, theory of; physiology; relics
Bollandists, 56n
*Bompetrus (son of Johannes [bursarius] of Bologna), 171
Bonaventure (Franciscan theologian and cardinal): and the eucharist-confession link, 14–15; and Gerson, 249; and the sacrament of confession, 10n, 12; on the seal of confession, 34–35, 37, 39n, 41–42; and the stigmata of Francis of Assisi, 166; and William of Auvergne, 248
* **Boneta, Na Prous, 222
Boniface (bishop of Lausanne), 33
Boniface VIII (pope), 150, 153
*Bonigrinus of Verona, cap. S. Thome de Apoxa, Bologna, 172
"Book of the Four Handmaidens, The," 92, 105
Bourg-en-Bresse, 300–301
**Bridget of Sweden, 129, 255, 256, 256n, 272–73, 274, 276–77, 283, 284, 285, 289; *The Book of Questions*, 264–65
Brown, Peter, 15, 73
Butler, Judith, 278n
Bynum, Caroline Walker, 50, 64n, 70, 77, 79, 184, 190n, 268; *Holy Feast and Holy Fast*, 7

Caesarius of Heisterbach (Cistercian prior and ascetical author), 31, 59n, 102n; on Becket, 64; and Conrad of Marburg, 89; *Dialogue on Miracles*, 88, 105; on Elisabeth of Schönau, 210–11; on fraud, 193, 194, 195n; and heretical bravery, 62; on the translation of Elisabeth of Hungary, 140–41; and his vita of Elisabeth of Hungary, 88, 105–6, 107, 109–12, 115
*Caihanus of Narbonne, 201, 202
canonization, 5, 120, 127–37, 138–39, 140–41; of Armannus Punzilupus, 150–

52; of Bridget of Sweden, 264, 268, 274, 283, 285; of Clare of Montefalco, 146–48, 149–50, 211; confessor and, 131, 132, 238; of Conrad of Marburg, 98; of Dorothea of Montau, 131–32, 148–50; of Elena d'Oglio, 144–46; of Elisabeth of Hungary, 87, 91, 100, 101–2, 132; and female spirituality, 71; of Francis of Assisi, 166; Gerson on, 283, 289; and Gregory IX, 121; and Guglielma, 152, 153, 154, 155–56, 158–59; and incrimination, 164; and Innocent III, 120–21; and Innocent IV, 128; and inquisitional procedure, 121, 133, 144–45, 181, 182; and inquisition into heresy, 128, 129–30, 131, 132, 139–40, 142, 150–51; of Joan of Arc, 165, 291; and medical expertise, 146n, 204, 211; and the pope, 128, 129–30, 131, 133, 134, 135, 138, 139, 142, 291n; proof in, 181, 182; of Raymond of Peñafort, 28–29, 30; and scholasticism, 233–34; and translation, 140. *See also* saints

Carletti, Angelo (Franciscan theologian and canonist), 38–39; *Summa angelica*, 40

Cassian, John (monk and ascetical writer), 112–13, 282n

Cathars, 11n, 170n, 171n, 172n; and Armannus Punzilupus, 152; and Beguines, 51; and Dominic, 119; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 100; and Fulk, bishop of Toulouse, 49; and hell, 301; and Mary of Oignies, 50; mass executions of, 66; Perfect class of, 50, 63, 66, 73–74; on purgatory, 58; and resistance to inquisitors, 170, 172, 172n; suffering of, 60; and women, 50

**Catherine de la Rochelle, 255

**Catherine of Siena (tertiary Dominican and mystical author), 199, 256n, 284

Catherine of Westhusen (prioress), 219

Cazenave, Annie, 25–26

Cecilia (early martyr), 63

**Celestine V (Peter of Morrone, pope), 129, 130, 134–36, 137

charity, 40, 153

Charles VI (king of France), 272

Charles VII (king of France), 294n

Charles of Anjou, 184

chastity, 50, 87, 90. *See also* virginity

Chaucer, Geoffrey, *The Clerk's Tale*, 3

Christ: and Bridget of Sweden, 264; and Clare of Montefalco, 193; and deception, 245–46; devil poses as, 241, 242–43, 247, 250, 281; and Dorothea of Montau, 219–20; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 111; and Elisabeth of Spalbeek, 202; identification with, 184; incarnation of, 11; and Jews, 247; and John of Marienwerder, 219–20; as judge, 264; and knowledge as God vs. man, 38n; and Lutgard of Aywières, 55, 57; and Margaret of Cortona, 184; and Margaret of Ypres, 55; and Mary of Oignies, 52, 55; and Rixendis, 200, 202; and the sacrament of confession, 10; and the stigmata of Francis of Assisi, 168; suffering of, 244; and vicarious suffering, 74

**Christina of Saint Trond (alias Mirabilis), 53, 57n, 75–76, 81, 94n, 183, 199

**Christine of Stommeln, 184

Cistercians, 55, 56, 100, 153, 157, 158–59, 160, 162, 186

**Clare of Montefalco (abbess, Third Order of Augustinian Regulars), 64–65, 186, 190, 191, 192–93, 255; canonization of, 146–48, 149–50, 211

Claude. *See* Joan of Arc: false

Clement IV (pope), 122n, 123; *Ad extirpanda*, 125

Clement V (pope), 123n, 127, 129, 130, 135

Clement VIII, 30

clergy: accused of crime, 2, 17–18, 126; and female spirituality, 7–8, 47, 48; and fraud, 194; limits on the control of the, 5; and Lutgard of Aywières, 56; and the ordeal, 16; prosecution of, 9n, 17–18, 126, 172–73, 248, 284; and Sybil, 196–97; and women, 47–48, 278. *See also* bishop; College of Cardinals; confessor; inquisitor; mendicants; priest

clothing, 93–94, 105, 288, 290, 295

Coakley, John, 56

College of Cardinals, 133, 134, 135, 136. *See also* clergy; curia

commerce, 78, 79

Concerning the Office of the Inquisition, 126

confession: and inquisition into heresy, 25–26, 125, 126, 303; judicial, 11, 19, 21, 42; and proof, 18, 26; and trickery, 235; voluntary, 25–26

confession, sacrament of: and Alan of Lille, 11n; annual, 12, 13, 32; and Auda, 226; and Beguines, 4–5, 48–49, 51–52, 57–58; and Bonaventure, 12; and Christina Mirabilis, 76; coercion in, 39; and Conrad of Marburg, 101, 102, 298; and contritionism, 13–14; criticism of, 9; daily practice of, 51; denunciation by, 26, 27–28, 32–33, 36, 221, 224; divine origin of, 10; and Dorothea of Montau, 132, 149n, 219, 220; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 87, 101, 102, 298; and Elisabeth of Spalbeek, 187; and the eucharist, 14–15, 48; exculpation by, 36; and female sanctity, 2; and female spirituality, 4, 48–49, 298; and heresy, 10, 21, 43; and inquisition, 4, 13, 24, 25–26, 27–28, 32–33, 36, 220–26, 227–30, 298; and intention, 38, 39; invention of, 10; and judicial confession, 21; and judicial discourse, 19, 20, 24; and Lateran IV, 1, 9, 12–13, 19; and Lutgard of Aywières, 57; and Mary of Oignies, 51, 52; and medical discourse, 19–21, 24, 40; and Nider, 302; and orthodoxy, 14; and Raymond of Peñafort, 21–31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 51, 217n, 221; relational quality of, 48–49; and scrupulosity, 54, 212, 213, 214, 216, 300; seal of, 26, 27–28, 31–43, 132, 221, 224; and seal of secrecy, 37; and secrecy, 26, 27–28, 31–43, 132, 221, 224; and sin, 37; sufficiency of, 219; as surveillance, 12–13; and Thomas of Cantimpré, 53–54, 57; as voluntary, 21, 25–26; and women, 2, 4, 48, 49, 84, 219–20, 298. *See also* scrupulosity

confessor: agitation of the, 57; as bailiff, 20; of Beguines, 4; and canonization, 131, 132; Conrad of Marburg as, 106, 116; and the Council of Narbonne, 26n; devil as, 251; devotion to, 49; and Dorothea of Montau, 131–32, 149n, 220; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 85, 87, 88; and experiments on penitent, 184–85; Francis of Assisi on the, 93; Gerson on the, 283, 284, 285; as husband, 92, 93, 94, 95; importance to saint of the, 58; and inquisition, 27–28, 221, 228, 229; James of Vitry as, 49, 51, 58; as judge, 23; and Lateran IV, 51; lay, 38; and Lutgard of Aywières, 56; manuals for the, 19–20, 23, 24, 25–26, 34n, 35, 38, 40, 57, 217n; and Margaret of Ypres, 54, 55; and Mary of Oignies, 51, 52; and mendicants, 32–33; obedience to the, 92, 93; and pathology, 212; and Peter of Poitiers, 19–20; and proof, 27, 181; and Raymond of Peñafort, 23, 26, 27, 28; of Rixendis, 201; and sacrament of confession, 48–49; saint tested by, 184–85; and seal of confession, 31, 35, 37, 41–42; and spiritual vs. carnal love, 216–17, 268; vows to, 93; Zeger as, 54. *See also* clergy

Conrad of Marburg (inquisitor), 196; background of, 88–89; papal penitentiary Bernard on, 98–99, 56n; canonization of, 98; in Caesarius of Heisterbach, 105–6; as confessor, 95, 102–5, 116; death of, 110; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 5, 85, 87, 88, 89–92, 93–94, 95–96, 97, 101, 103–4, 105, 106, 110–11, 114–15, 116, 121, 298; as evil, 95, 98, 100, 110, 115; and Gregory IX, 95–96, 97–98, 99, 101, 104, 106, 116; and heresy, 85, 88, 96–100, 106; and Innocent III, 88; as inquisitor, 85, 96–100, 103, 104, 105, 106, 110, 115; as "Living God," 95, 133–14; and Lucardis, 77; martyrdom of, 97–98, 99, 100; opposition to, 98–100, 173; and purgative probation, 110–15; sanctity of, 97; as teacher, 111–12; and the Thuringian church, 96

Conrad of Thuringia (Teutonic knight), 91

conscience: erroneous, 214, 215, 216, 241, 247n; and heresy, 241–42; as morally binding, 214–15; new sensitivity to, 13; and Raymond of Peñafort, 23; scrupulosity of, 4–5, 51, 54, 211–30, 241, 266, 299, 300; and sin, 241–42. *See also* sin

consolamentum, 50, 73–74

Constance, Council of (1414–17), 9, 268, 274

* **Constance of Rabastens, 222, 272

contrition, 25–26, 214

contritionism, 9n, 13–14

Conventual Franciscans, 174

*Corbicincus (son of Benevenutus de Gaglano of Bologna), 170

*Cornelius, William, of Antwerp, 152n

crime, 43, 82. *See also* confession: and judicial confession

Crusades, 11, 88, 100, 101. *See also* Albigensian Crusade
Cunegund (empress), 100n
curia, 133, 137, 138. *See also* College of Cardinals

D'Ailly, Peter (theologian, chancellor of Paris, cardinal), 246–48, 257, 266, 267, 270–71, 272; *On the False Prophets*, 260–62
David of Augsburg (Franciscan inquisitor), *Tractatus*, 175
death: and Beguines, 298; and canonization, 129; of Catherine of Siena, 199; of Christina Mirabilis, 75, 76, 199; of Conrad of Marburg, 110; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 101; and female spirituality, 70, 298; of heretics, 60, 62, 68, 72; and hysteria, 207; and inquisition into heresy, 130, 140; in life, 73, 211; of Ludwig, landgrave of Thuringia, 89, 90, 107; of Magdalena Beutler, 197, 198; of Margaret of Ypres, 55; of Mary of Oignies, 52; penalty of, 40, 81, 123, 170, 171n; and rapture, 70; unjust, 60; of Vanna of Orvieto, 180, 199n
De Certeau, Michel, 193
*Délicieux, Bernard (Franciscan), 172, 173
delusion, 209, 210, 278n. *See also* imagination; visions
demon(s)/devil(s): and Albert the Great, 237; Aquinas on, 238; as confessor, 251; and Conrad of Marburg, 98, 115; as deceivers, 241, 250–51, 252–55; and fear, 219; as female religious, 251; Gerson on, 274; and heretics, 62; and idolatry, 241, 242–43; and Joan of Arc, 290; and Jordan of Saxony, 252; and love, 216–17; and Mary of Oignies, 64, 80–81; and the passions, 208–9, 213, 217; and physiology, 218; pose as Christ, 242–44, 250, 281; scholar as, 238–39; and scrupulosity, 216–17; and spiritual discernment, 250–55; and suffering, 3, 79–80, 260; and theology, 264. *See also* Satan
demoniac(s), 62; and the devil, 210; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 116; harm to, 254; and Jordan of Saxony, 252; Magdalena Beutler as, 198–99; Thomas of Cantimpré on, 68; William of Auvergne on, 62, 69n, 198, 208–9, 253–54
**Denis the Carthusian (monk and theologian), 257n, 259n, 263n
denunciation. *See* accusation/denunciation
deposition. *See* testimony/deposition
Derrida, Jacques, 282n
determinatio, 234. *See also* scholasticism
devils. *See* demon(s)/devil(s)
devil's advocate, 136
dialectic, 234–35
Dinzelbacher, Peter, 4
discipline, 80, 220
disputatio, 233, 234, 236, 264, 277
Dominic (founder of Dominican order), 119, 169–70, 171, 173
Dominicans, 22, 32–33, 35, 170, 171, 197. *See also* mendicants
Donadieu, Martin (Dominican inquisitor), 61
**Dorothea of Montau (anchoress), 93, 131–32, 148–50, 181–82, 219, 221, 227n, 256
**Douceline of Dignes (Beguine), 184
Durand, William (bishop of Mende, canonist), 162n
*Durban, Bernardus of Lodève, 176
*Durban, Esclarmonda of Lodève, 60n, 174–77
*Durban, Raymondus of Lodève, 176

ecstasy. *See* rapture
**Elena d'Oglio, 144–46, 152, 202
Eligius (or Eloi; patron saint of goldsmiths), 69n
**Elisabeth of Hungary (landgravine of Thuringia), 85–88, 89–96, 97, 100–116, 192; beating of, 102, 104, 106, 111–12, 114; body of, 157; canonization of, 87, 91, 100, 101–2, 132; children of, 90n, 102; and Conrad of Marburg, 5, 85, 87, 88, 89–92, 93–94, 95–96, 97, 101, 103–4, 105, 106, 110–11, 114–15, 116, 121, 298; and Gregory IX, 5, 48, 85, 87n, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95–96, 101, 114, 132, 140; and heresy, 5, 86, 100–102, 104, 164; and inquisition, 5, 87, 101, 103, 104, 121; and marriage, 86–87, 92, 93–95; obedience of, 86, 87, 90, 92, 101, 102, 104, 105–6, 111; purgative probation of, 109–11, 114–15; and Raymond of Peñafort, 5, 10, 85, 90, 91; relics of, 72, 100, 141; sanctity of, 97; status of, 181; translation of, 112, 140–41

**Elisabeth of Schonau (Benedictine nun), 211
**Elisabeth of Spalbeek, 186–88, 189, 191, 202, 293
emotions/passions, 208–9, 217, 262. *See also* fear
epilepsy, 226, 301, 302. *See also* illness
*Ermengardis Garauda de Muro Veteri of Pamiers, 224, 298
**Ermine of Reims, 243n, 251n, 254–55, 279–80, 282, 284, 285
Esmein, Adhémar, 182n
Este, Ercole d' (duke of Ferrara), 191–92, 194, 263, 300
espionage. *See* informant/surveillance
eucharist: Aquinas on, 16–17; and Auda, 223, 224; and Beguines, 50–51; and confession, 14–15, 48; devotion to the, 184; and female sanctity, 2; and female spirituality, 48, 298; Gerson on the, 268; and heresy, 17; and Jews, 184n; and Lateran IV, 1, 17; and menstruating women, 218; and the ordeal, 16–17; and orthodoxy, 14; as sole food, 252; and transubstantiation, 11
excommunication, 12, 102, 124, 170
exhumation, 140, 141, 152n, 163, 163n. *See also* translation
Eymeric, Nicolas (Dominican theologian and inquisitor), 30, 126, 177, 225–26, 234–35, 236

fast. *See* food
fear, 54, 213, 214, 216, 218, 219. *See also* emotions/passions
female mystics: doubts about, 5; and justice, 78; as living dead, 70, 73, 74; and medicine, 204; and Nider, 302; and politics, 264; proof of, 183–84; and purgatory, 78, 299; as relics, 70, 71–72, 73; and scholasticism, 236–37; and spiritual discernment, 262–63
female spirituality: and asceticism, 63; and the body, 72, 73, 182–84, 300; and the boundary between life and death, 64, 71, 75, 81; and canonization, 71; and Cathars, 63; and the clergy, 7–8, 47, 48; and confession, 4, 48–49, 298; and the confessor, 49; constraints on, 219; criminalization of, 1; and d'Ailly, 270–71; and death, 70, 298; decline of, 264; and the eucharist, 48, 298; and Gerson, 249, 264, 267–70, 273–84, 292, 293, 300, 303; and heresy, 59, 63, 70, 72; and inquisition, 2–3, 4, 299–300; and intercession, 73; and James of Vitry, 70; and martyrdom, 63, 70; and miracles, 73; and orthodoxy, 3; pathologization of the, 204–211, 249; and proof, 298; and rapture, 182–87, 188; and sacraments, 48, 297–98; and suffering, 70; and Thomas of Cantimpré, 70; and veneration, 74. *See also* women
food: and Christina Mirabilis, 94n; and the Elisabeth-Conrad relationship, 94; eucharist as, 252; fasting from, 50, 268; Gerson on, 268; and Rixendis, 202; and Sybil, 195, 196, 197. *See also* asceticism
Foreville, Raymonde, 13n
Foucault, Michel, 14, 276
Foucois, Gui. *See* Clement IV
Fournier, James (Benedict XII, Cistercian inquisitor, bishop of Pamiers), 223, 225, 227, 298, 299
**Frances of Rome (founder of a lay order of Benedictine oblates), 184–85
Franciscans, 170, 171; Conventual, 174; and Margaret of Cortona, 184; and the seal of confession, 32; Spiritual, 164–65, 173–74, 177; and the stigmata, 167, 188; and Sybil, 197; Third Order, 177. *See also* mendicants
*Francischus de Garbagniate of Milan (cleric), 161
**Francis of Assisi (founder of the Franciscan order), 93, 166–69, 180, 181n, 189n, 200, 205, 255
Fraticelli. *See* Beguins
Frederick II (emperor), 91, 140
Free Spirit movement, 267n, 270
Freud, Sigmund, 203, 204
Fulk (bishop of Toulouse), 49–50, 51

Gaetani, James (cardinal), 129, 130, 133–36, 137, 139
Galen, Claudius, 205, 206, 207, 209n. *See also* humors, theory of
Gerhard (companion to Conrad of Marburg), 102, 104, 116
Gerson, John (theologian and chancellor of Paris): on academic inquiry, 248, 249; and academic mysticism, 273; and

Bridget of Sweden, 166n, 264, 268, 274, 276–77, 283, 284, 285, 289; and censorship, 284; on confession, 14, 57n; on contemplation, 249, 278; and contemporary problems, 267–68, 271–72; on curiosity, 248, 249, 269, 273, 274, 275; on demons and scholars, 238; and female spirituality, 249, 264, 267–70, 273–84, 292, 293, 300, 303; and humoral theory, 277; and inquisitional procedure, 248, 264, 277, 283, 284, 285, 289, 293, 300, 303; on intention, 274; and Joan of Arc, 6, 264, 285–90, 291, 292–94; on living saints, 181; and medicine, 277; and misogyny, 269, 273–74, 275, 278–79, 293; on money-changers, 281–82; and pathology, 249; and physiology, 277; and proof, 285; on reserved sin, 227; and scholasticism, 247–49, 259, 276, 277, 293; and scrupulosity, 212–17; and a shadow text, 277, 289; on spiritual discernment, 5–6, 257, 264–66, 268, 269, 270, 275, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 289, 292, 293, 296, 300; and theology, 273, 275; on the university, 6, 247–48, 249, 273, 275, 284, 289. *Works*: *Against the Curiosity of Students*, 248; *De puella Aurelianensi*, 286n, 292, 293–94; *Mountain of Contemplation*, 276n; *On Distinguishing True from False Revelations*, 268, 281; *One Hundred Utterances concerning Impulses*, 276; *On the Examination of Doctrine*, 248–49, 277, 280–81, 283–84, 300; *On the Proving of Spirits*, 268, 276, 282–83

Gertrude (daughter of Elisabeth of Hungary), 102

Gertrude of Hungary (wife of Andrew II of Hungary), 86

*Gervaise of Tilbury (courtier and canon), 60n

Gilbert of Tournai (theologian and master general of the Franciscan order), *Collection of the Scandals of the Church*, 188

*Giles of Mantes (Augustinian friar and theologian), 246

*Girardus de Novazano of Milan (tertiary Franciscan), 159, 162n

Given, James, 174

Glossa ordinaria, 69

God: absolute power of, 239, 245–46, 248; and absolution, 221; and canonization, 128; as cause of evil and sin, 246; and Christina Mirabilis, 75, 76; and confession, 10, 35; confession to, 54; and contingency, 240; as deceiver, 237–44, 245, 246; and demonic influence, 213; and demonic rapture, 253; and Dorothea of Montau, 227n; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 86n, 101, 102, 103, 110, 111, 115, 116; and Francis of Assisi, 167, 169; and Gerson, 280, 281, 288; and heresy, 170, 221; husband as, 92; and illusion, 239; and Joan of Arc, 288; knowing as, 38n, 41–42; as loquacious, 266; love of, 260; and Mary of Oignies, 77, 80; and the ordeal, 15, 17; and priest as doctor, 20; and the priesthood, 114; proving by, 3, 80, 107, 108, 282; and spiritual discernment, 259; submission to, 21

Godefroid of Fontaines (theologian and canon), 38

Goffred of Trani (canon and civil lawyer), 127

grace, 31, 258, 300

Gratian (monk and canonist), *Decretum*, 292

Greenspan, Karen, 199n

Gregorian Reform, 16

Gregory I (the Great, pope), 27–28n, 277n, 282n; and Isidore of Seville, 114; and martyrdom, 63; *Moralia on Job*, 108, 109, 166; on sin and "the habit of good minds," 211–12, 216, 218, 221

Gregory IX (Hugolino of Ostia, pope): and Beguines, 47–48, 90; and papal penitentiary Bernard, 56n, 98; and canonization, 121; and confession, 32, 41n; and Conrad of Marburg, 95–96, 97–98, 99, 101, 104, 106, 116; *Decretals* of, 22, 24, 29, 128, 286, 290; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 5, 48, 85, 87n, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95–96, 101, 114, 132, 140; and Franciscans, 32; and Francis of Assisi, 166; and heresy, 96; and inquisitional procedure, 24, 121; and James of Vitry, 52, 90; and Mary of Oignies, 71, 72, 90; and Raymond of Peñafort, 22, 29; and Raymond VI of Toulouse, 143; and the Thuringian church, 96; *Universis Christi fidelibus*, 166

Gregory XI (pope), 284

Gregory of Rimini (theologian), 247n
Guda (handmaid to Elisabeth of Hungary), 105
* **Guglielma of Milan (princess of Bohemia), 150, 152–63, 156, 193, 202, 299
Guglielmites, 123, 137, 154–58, 159, 161–62, 171, 202, 222
Gui, Bernard (Dominican inquisitor and bishop of Lodève), 126, 133, 137n; on Bernard Délicieux, 172, 173; on the body of Olivi, 163; on the inquisitor's pastoral role, 228; and insanity, 203; and Petrus Dominici of Narbonne, 177; and the revolt at Albi, 170; on scribes, 124; and the scrupulosity of the accused, 222; on sentencing heretics, 139; on torture, 236; on trickery, 235; on Waldensians, 171n
*Guiard de Cressonessart (cleric), 172, 212
Gy, Pierre-Marie, 10n, 12n

* **Hadewijch (Beguine), 77n
hagiography, 188, 191
Haskins, Charles Homer, 69
heart: of Clare of Montefalco, 186, 190, 191; of Elena d'Oglio, 145, 146; and fear, 218; of Margaret of Città di Castello, 146n; of Mary of Oignes, 210; physiology of the, 213; and rapture, 210–11; Thomas of Cantimpré on, 208. *See also* body
heaven, 200, 201
hell, 75, 77, 79, 83, 300, 301
Henry (count of Seyn), 97, 104
Henry of Friemar (Augustinian hermit and theologian), 260, 266, 270; *Treatise on the Four Impulses*, 257–59
Henry of Ghent (philosopher and theologian), 37, 39n
Henry of Langenstein (or Hessia; theologian), 141, 257, 262, 264–65, 270, 271n; *On the Discernment of Spirits*, 259–60
Henry of Susa. *See* Hostiensis
heresy: abjuration of, 126; absolution from, 221; Aquinas on, 35, 69; and Armannus Punzilupus, 151; and asceticism, 50; assessment of, 116; and Beguines, 59; and Beguins, 173–78; and Caesarius of Heisterbach, 62; as category, 4; confession to God alone as, 54; and confession (judicial), 26, 123, 126, 303; and confession (sacramental), 10, 21, 27–28, 34–35, 43, 221; and Conrad of Marburg, 85, 88, 96–100, 106; and conscience, 241–42; converts from, 103; of Cornelius, 152n; and death, 72; and Dominic, 119, 170; and Dominicans, 32–33; and Dorothea of Montau, 149; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 5, 86, 100–102, 104, 164; and the eucharist, 17; and exculpation by the confessor's testimony, 36; and exhumation, 140, 141, 152n; and false faith, 244; and family, 130, 141, 143, 154, 165, 176; and female spirituality, 59, 63, 70, 72; and Francis of Assisi, 168; and Frederick II, 91; of the Free Spirit, 267n, 268n, 270; and Gerson, 285; and Gregory IX, 96; and Gregory the Great, 109; and Gy, 12n; impersonating a priest as, 31–32; and James of Vitry, 48, 50, 52, 62–63, 70, 73, 74, 299; and Joan of Arc, 291, 292; and Job, 109; and judgment, 76–77, 299; Kelly on, 2n; and Lateran IV, 1, 11–14, 17, 48, 120; local inquiry into, 119–20; local persecution of, 120; and Margaret of Ypres, 54; and martyrdom, 60, 62, 180, 299; and Mary of Oignies, 50, 52, 62–63; mass executions for, 66; and mendicants, 32–33; and Peter Martyr, 170; proof of, 2; and purgatory, 58, 299; and Raymond of Peñafort, 24–25, 26–27, 28, 35, 164; recognition of, 59; and relics, 72; resistance to inquisitor as, 170–78; and Robert le Bougre, 69, 173, 196; and Rotlandus de Valle Brito, 32; and saints, 1; and salvation for all, 77; and the seal of confession, 27–28, 34–35, 221; and self-incrimination, 221–22; and suffering, 81; and theology, 239, 245–46, 248, 284; and Thomas of Cantimpré, 65, 68, 70, 73, 74, 299; and torture, 3, 125–26; and translation of the body, 141; and trickery, 235; William of Auvergne on, 62, 69–70, 69n; of woman at Bourg-en-Bresse, 301; and women, 50. *See also* inquisition, into heresy
**Hildegard of Bingen (Benedictine abbess, mystical and medical author, composer), 206n, 270, 270n, 271, 271n, 272
Hohman, Thomas, 266n

Holkot, Robert (Dominican theologian), 239–41, 242–44, 247
Hollywood, Amy, 191n
Holy Ghost, 153, 160, 171n
Hostiensis (Henry of Susa; canonist), 127, 128, 129, 130, 137, 243
Hugolino of Ostia. *See* Gregory IX
Humbert of Romans (master general of the Dominican order), 34
humility, 112–13, 280. *See also* obedience; submission
**Humility of Faenza (Vallombrosan abbess), 57n
humors, theory of: and Albert the Great, 207; and Galen, 205, 206, 207, 209n; and Gerson, 213, 216, 269; and Henry of Langenstein, 259; and Nider, 218; and prophecy, 262; and William of Auvergne, 206–7. *See also* medicine; pathology; physiology
Hundred Years War, 260, 267, 272, 273
*Hus, John (Bohemian theologian), 9
husband, 92, 93, 94, 95. *See also* marriage
hysteria, 207–8. *See also* humors, theory of; medicine; pathology

*Iacobus (rector of Saint Thomas de Merchato of Milan), 172
idolatry, 241, 242–43, 247, 274, 290–91
Ignatius (early martyr), 67
illness: of Black Death, 267; of Clare of Montefalco, 147, 211; of Elena d'Oglio, 146; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 100; and Elisabeth of Schönau, 211; endurance of, 190n; of Lydwine of Schiedam, 189–91; of Mary of Oignies, 80–81; and penance, 82; as proof, 262; and rapture, 210; and induced rapture, 253. *See also* epilepsy; pathology; suffering
imagination, 167, 198, 205, 208, 209, 210. *See also* insanity
incrimination, 143–44, 164, 221–22, 225. *See also* accusation/denunciation; proof
incubus, 103n, 227n
indulgence, 91, 106, 125–26, 139, 158
informant/surveillance, 12–13, 27, 28, 103, 104, 111, 125. *See also* witness
Innocent III (pope), 11, 17–19, 31, 61, 75, 88, 100n, 120–21, 143. *See also* Lateran IV, Council of
Innocent IV (pope), 36, 56n, 128, 143
inquisition, into heresy: and the Albigensian Crusade, 59; and Armannus Punzilupus, 150–52; and Auda, 223–24; and Beguins, 173–78; at Bourg-en-Bresse, 300–301; and canonization, 128, 129–30, 131, 132, 139–40, 142, 150–51; and Clare of Montefalco, 164–65; clerical resistance to, 172–73; and confession, 4; and Conrad of Marburg, 85, 96–100, 103, 104, 105, 106, 110, 115; and the dead, 130, 140; and the death sentence, 40, 81, 123, 170, 171n; development of the, 119–20; and entrapment, 125; excesses of the, 164n; exhumation and burning by the, 140; and family, 130, 141, 143, 154, 165; funding of the, 123; and Guglielma of Milan, 152, 154, 159–60, 161, 163; and Guglielmites, 154–58, 159, 171; incrimination in, 143–44; and James, king of Aragon, 25; and Joan of Arc, 165, 291, 292; Kelly on, 2n; and Leonardus of Foligno, 168–69; local, 119–20; manuals for the, 13, 25–26, 36, 76, 122n, 131, 227, 303; and Marguerite Porete, 212; mistaken, 142; and penalty, 123, 139; and the papacy, 142, 170; protocol for, 5, 121–27; and Raymond VI of Toulouse, 143–44; of Raymond of Peñafort, 30; resistance to, 170–78; reveals sanctity, 164–65; and Richer of Sens, 196; and Rixendis, 200–201, 202–3; and Rotlandus de Valle Brito, 32; and the sacrament of confession, 4, 13, 25–26, 27–28, 32–33, 220–26, 227–30, 298; and scrupulosity, 223; and the seal of confession, 28, 32–33, 221; and secrecy, 123, 125; and torture, 3, 303; and translation, 140, 141. *See also* confession
inquisitional procedure, 297; and canonization, 121, 129–38, 144–45, 181, 182, 299; definition of, 2; and *disputatio*, 277; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 5, 87, 101, 103, 105, 121; and female spirituality, 2–3, 4, 299–300; and Gerson, 248, 264, 277, 283, 284, 285, 289, 293, 300, 303; and heresy, 121–27, 133, 299; for heresy and sanctity, 3, 5; and Innocent III, 17–18; and Lateran IV, 1, 17–18, 120, 125; and Nider, 302; and proof, 15; and Raymond of Peñafort, 24–25; and the sacrament of confession, 24, 27;

inquisitional procedure (*cont.*)
and scholasticism, 5, 233–34, 235–37, 277, 299
inquisitor: into canonization, 133; and confession, 13; and confessor, 228, 229; and Guglielma, 160; into heresy, 137–38; and heresy vs. canonization, 142; indulgences for the, 125–26; Kieckhefer on the, 2n; martyrdom of the, 60–61, 130; pastoral role of the, 227–28; as physician, 228; as prosecutor and chief judge, 127; resistance to the, 170–78; and saints, 105; into sanctity, 130; sanctity of the, 130; testing by the, 238; and trial of Guglielmites, 154; and a willingness for martyrdom, 60. *See also* clergy
insanity, 203, 218, 253, 268, 274, 278. *See also* illness; imagination; pathology
intentionality, 38, 39, 215, 271, 274. *See also* conscience; interiority
intercession: and Beguines, 77; by Christina Mirabilis, 75, 76; of Elisabeth of Hungary, 101; and female mystics, 78, 299; in hell, 300, 301; of Mary of Oignies, 75, 80; power of, 73; in purgatory, 49, 57n, 58, 78, 80, 200, 301; of queens, 78
interiority, 10, 13. *See also* conscience; intentionality
interrogation, 23–24, 27, 91, 125. *See also* inquisitional procedure
Irmingard (handmaid to Elisabeth of Hungary), 102
*Isabella of Bourges, 235
Isentrud (handmaid to Elisabeth of Hungary), 102, 103, 104, 110–11, 114
Isidore of Seville (bishop and encyclopedist), 114

*Jacobus de Ferno of Milan, 162n
James I (king of Aragon), 25
James of Viterbo (Augustinian theologian), 38n
James of Vitry (theologian and bishop of Acre), 49–58; and Albigensian Crusade, 52; and Beguines, 47, 48; and Cathar Perfect class, 74; and confessor's importance, 49, 58; and female spirituality, 70; and Gerson, 289; and Gregory IX, 52, 90; and heresy, 48, 50, 52, 62–63, 70, 73, 74, 299; and judgment, 77; and living saints, 181; and Lutgard of Aywières, 57n, 75; and Mary of Oignies, 47, 49–52, 53, 56, 62–63, 64, 71, 72, 75, 76n, 107, 210, 216, 218; and purgatory, 58, 75; and relics, 71, 72, 175; and seal of confession, 33, 41n; and temptation, 57n; and Thomas of Cantimpré, 52, 56
*Jaoule, Berengarius, of Lodève, 175, 177
Jerome (monk and church father), 269, 277n, 282n
Jews, 184n, 247
Joan of Arc, 6, 165, 222, 255–56, 264, 285–90, 291, 292–94, 295, 296, 302; false, 294–95
Job, 108–9
Johannes of San Nicolo (cardinal), 151
*John (lay informant to Conrad of Marburg), 103
John XXII (pope), 129, 137n
John Climacus (monk and ascetical author), 113–14
John of Dambach (Dominican theologian), 115
John of Freiburg (Dominican theologian), 227; and Aquinas, 36; on confession, 57n; on knowing as God vs. man, 42; on perjury, 41; and the sacrament of confession, 10n; *Summa confessorum*, 35–36
John of Marienwerder (canon, theologian, confessor to Dorothea of Montau), 131–32, 148, 149, 181–82, 217n, 227n; *Septililium*, 219
*John of Mirecourt (Cistercian theologian), 245
*John of Pouilly (theologian), 9
John Pulicinus of Mevania (Franciscan chaplain), 147
Jordan of Saxony (master general of Dominican order), 58, 252, 257n, 258n
Joseph, cult of, 267n
judge: and canonization, 133; confessor as, 23; Christ as, 264; acts ex officio, 18; and Gerson on Joan of Arc, 287; pressure from the, 39; priest as, 14, 19; and scholasticism, 234; secular, 42
judgment, 78; and canonization, 133; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 101, 102; false, 247; and heresy, 76–77, 299; and inquisition into heresy, 127, 133, 139–40
judicial discourse, 19, 20, 24
justice, 15; Aquinas on, 218; and female mystics, 78; and heresy, 59; and inquisi-

tion into heresy, 170; and Job, 108–9; and purgatory, 74; summary, 127, 133, 142, 143; in Thomas of Cantimpré, 84

Kalteisen, Henry (Dominican inquisitor), 295
Kaluza, Zénon, 247
Kelly, Henry Ansgar, 2n, 123n
**Kempe, Margery, 226–27
Kieckhefer, Richard, 2n, 4
Kleinberg, Aviad, 4, 134n
knowledge, 33, 38n, 41–42
Kunegond of Nuremberg (nun), 219
Lacan, Jacques, 72, 229, 294

Lactantius (patristic apologist), 248
laity, 11, 13, 48, 181
Lansing, Carol, 151
Lateran IV, Council of (1215), 1, 4; and the Bible, 10; Canon 3, 11; Canon 8, 17–18; Canon 18, 16; Canon 21, 12–13, 14, 48; and the eucharist, 17; and excommunication, 102n; and heresy, 11–14, 17, 48, 120; and inquisition, 1, 17–18, 120, 125; and the ordeal, 16, 42; and priest as judge, 19; and proof, 17; on relics, 73, 128; and the sacrament of confession, 9, 12–13, 19, 14, 32, 51, 219; and the sacraments, 1, 11; and the seal of confession, 31
Lea, H. C., 97, 158
Le Goff, Jacques, 78
Le Graveur, John (Franciscan, confessor to Ermine of Reims), 279n
Lenterius of Narbonne (canon lawyer), 200
Leo X (pope), 144
*Leonardus of Foligno (Silvestrine monk), 168–69
lepers, 94–95, 192n
Lerner, Robert, 174n, 268n, 173n
lilies, 63, 65
Louis (count of Looz), 76n
Louis IX (king of France), 134, 143, 181, 233
love: carnal, 209; carnal vs. spiritual, 65, 210, 216–17, 258, 268, 281n; and a chameleon, 205; Gerson on, 268; and Margaret of Ypres, 55; and rapture, 210; roses as symbol of, 68. *See also* sexuality
lovesickness, 209
**Lucardis, 77
**Lucia of Narni (Dominican nun), 191–92, 194, 263, 300
Luciferan sect, 77n
Ludwig (landgrave of Thuringia), 86–88, 89, 90, 94, 96, 106, 107, 192n
**Lutgard of Aywières (Cistercian nun), 53, 103n; elevation of, 183; and Innocent III, 75; and James of Vitry, 57n, 75; life of, 55–56; martyrdom of, 65–66, 68; and Mary of Oignies, 75; and miracles, 70; and nuptial imagery, 55; and purgatory, 57n, 75; relics of, 70, 71; sin of, 216; and Thomas of Cantimpré, 53, 56, 57, 183
Lutzenberg, Bernard, 69n
**Lydwine of Schiedam, 183, 185n, 189–91

*Malaura, Bernardus, of Lodève, 174
*Manenta (wife of Bernardus Malaura of Lodève)
manuals: for confessors, 19–20, 23, 24, 25–26, 34n, 35, 38, 40, 57, 217n; for heretical inquisition, 13, 25–26, 36, 76, 122n, 125, 131, 227, 303. *See also* confession; confessor; inquisitional procedure
**Margaret of Città di Castello (tertiary Dominican), 146n
**Margaret of Cortona (anchoress), 184
**Margaret of Faenza (Vallombrosan nun), 146n
**Margaret of Ypres, 53, 54–55, 65, 68, 93
Marie of Valenciennes. *See* Porete, Marguerite
marriage, 3, 11, 50, 86–87, 92, 93, 94, 95
Marsilio, Peter (Dominican chronicler), 25, 30
Martini, Corradus, 169
Martin of Tours (bishop; early confessor saint), 250
*Martinus of Saint Antonius of Clermont, 176
martyrdom: and asceticism, 63; and Beguines, 298; and Beguins, 174, 175, 177, 178; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 100; and female spirituality, 63, 70; and heresy, 60, 62, 68, 72, 180, 299; and living women as relics, 72; of Lutgard of Aywières, 65–66; of Margaret of Ypres, 65;

martyrdom (*cont.*)
of Mary of Oignies, 64; and Na Prous Boneta, 222; proof of, 3; public vs. secret, 63; red vs. white, 63–64, 65, 67, 68; rhetoric of, 59, 64–65; self-imposed vs. external, 81; superiority of stigmata to, 180; and Thomas of Cantimpré, 65, 66–70, 83; transformation of, 83–84, 65–66, 181; white, 100
Mary of Brabant (second wife of Philip III of France), 189
*Mary of Oignies (Beguine), 47, 76n, 166n, 175; and the Albigensian Crusade, 62–63; and fasting, 50; and God, 77; and Gregory IX, 71, 72, 90; heart condition of, 210; and heresy, 50, 52, 62–63; and James of Vitry, 47, 49–52, 53, 56, 62–63, 64, 71, 72, 75, 76n, 107, 210, 216, 218; and judgment, 77–78; and Lutgard of Aywières, 75; and Margaret of Ypres, 54; martyrdom of, 64; and nuptial imagery, 55; and purgative probation, 79–80, 107; and purgatory, 62–63, 75; and relics, 70, 71, 72; and the sacrament of confession, 51; sin of, 51, 52, 54, 64, 216; suffering of, 80–81; and Thomas of Cantimpré, 53, 75
Matteotti, John (confessor to Frances of Rome), 185
* **Mayfreda de Pirovano of Milan, 153–54, 156–57, 159, 161, 162
McGuire, Brian, 217n
medicine, 5; and canonization, 204; and confession, 19–21, 24, 40; and female spirituality, 212, 300; and Francis of Assisi, 167; and Gerson, 264, 277; and the inquisitor's role, 228. *See also* humors, theory of; pathology; physiology
melancholia, 209, 218, 226, 245, 262, 278, 278n. *See also* humors, theory of
melancholic complexion, 206–7
men/masculinity, 83, 194, 204–5, 277
mendicants: and canonization, 132; as confessors, 32; and conflict with the secular clergy, 9n, 146, 150n, 151, 158n; and Conrad of Marburg, 89, 97; and heresy, 32–33; and pope, 32, 170; and scholasticism, 234; as scribes, 124; and seal of confession, 32. *See also* Dominicans; Franciscans
Michaud-Quantin, Pierre, 215
miracles: of Armannus Punziupus, 151–52; attribution to, 260; and the body, 67, 144, 252; and canonization, 128, 129, 131, 135, 136, 181; of Clare of Montefalco, 191; of Dorothea of Montau, 132; of Elisabeth of Hungary, 90, 94; from an evil source, 261; and female spirituality, 73; Gerson on, 268; and *On the Good and the Evil Spirit*, 290; of Guglielma, 154, 155–56, 159; of heretics, 62; Hostiensis on, 128; illusory, 128; and Lutgard of Aywières, 70; of Margaret of Ypres, 55n; and Mary of Oignies, 56n; of Raymond of Peñafort, 29–30; of Rixendis, 201; warnings about, 128
misogyny, 269, 271n, 273–74, 275, 278–79, 292, 293
Mönch, John (bishop of Marienwerder), 148
Monica (Augustine of Hippo's mother), 269
Morel, John (monastic prior), 279, 280
mother, 56, 90n, 102, 205
*Myranus (chaplain of Saint Firmus of Milan), 155, 156

Narbonne, Council of (1243 or 1244), 26n, 36
Newman, Barbara, 4, 77, 79
Nicholas de Tudeschi. *See* Panormitanus
Nicholas of Hohenstein (bishop's *officialis*), 149
Nicholas of Lyre (Franciscan theologian), 109
Nider, John (Dominican theologian), 211, 254, 271n, 302–3; *Consolation of a Timorous Conscience*, 218–19; *Formicarium*, 197, 198, 199, 294–96
notary, role of, 123, 124, 126, 133
nuptial imagery, 55, 93

Oakley, Francis, 271n
oath, 40–41, 42, 102, 103
obedience: of Elisabeth of Hungary, 86, 87, 90, 92, 101, 102, 104, 105–6, 111; of Margaret of Ypres, 55; in marriage, 92; of penitent, 92, 93. *See also* submission
Ockhamites, 5, 239, 244, 245, 257
*Olivi, Peter John (Franciscan theologian), 163, 222, 244n

On the Good and the Evil Spirit, 289, 290–92, 293, 294, 296n
ordeal, 1, 15, 16, 17, 18, 42
orthodoxy, 2, 3, 14, 15, 168
Ovid, *The Remedies of Love*, 292

pagans, 243–44
Panormitanus (Nicholas de Tudeschi; canon lawyer), 10, 42
Paolini, Lorenzo, 137n
Park, Katherine, 146n
passion. *See* emotions/passions
pathology, 5, 203–11, 212, 217, 249, 263, 266, 300. *See also* humors, theory of; illness; medicine; physiology
Paul (apostle), 186; on knowledge vs. love, 258; and ordeal, 17; on pride, 238; and rapture, 182, 185; and spiritual discernment, 250, 262; stigmata of, 189n, 192
Paul III (pope), 30
Pelhisson, William (Dominican chronicler), 60, 141
penance: and abuse of women, 85; appropriate, 38; and Beguines, 51; and Christina Mirabilis, 75, 76; on earth, 81; and inquisition into heresy, 123; and Lutgard of Aywières, 57; and Mary of Oignies, 51, 52, 80; money payment as, 123; self-inflicted, 82; and sickness, 82; and Thomas of Cantimpré, 52
penance, sacrament of. *See* confession
penitent: confessor's experiments on, 184–85; and evil intention, 38, 39; image of, 14; Margaret of Ypres as, 54; obedience of, 92, 93; permission of, 37, 38, 39; Raymond VI as, 143; and Raymond of Peñafort, 23, 27; and a sentence for heresy, 139–40; and spiritual vs. carnal love, 216–17; wife as, 92, 93, 94; woman as ideal, 219–20
persecution, rhetoric of, 64–65
Peter Lombard (theologian and bishop of Paris), 11n
Peter Martyr (Peter of Verona; Dominican inquisitor), 169–70, 173
Peter of Castro (protoinquisitor), 61
Peter of Colonna (cardinal), 134, 233
Peter of Corbeil (theologian and archbishop of Sens), 82–83
Peter of Luca (prior of canonry and confessor to Elena d'Oglio), 144, 145
Peter of Morrone. *See* Celestine V
Peter of Palude (Dominican theologian), 39
Peter of Poitiers (theologian and chancellor of Paris), 19–20
*Peter of Salomon, 164–65
Peter of Spain (theologian), 209n
Peter of Verona. *See* Peter Martyr
Peter the Chanter (theologian), 234
*Petronilla of La Charité, 229n
*Petrus Clericus of Montaillou (priest), 43
*Petrus Dominici of Narbonne (tertiary Franciscan), 177–78
*Petrus Egleysa of Narbonne (cleric), 176n
*Petrus Maurinus of Montaillou, 171n
phantastica luminaria, 198. *See also* imagination
Philip III (king of France), 189
Philip of Clairvaux (Cistercian abbot), 186–88, 189, 202
physiology: and Auda, 226; of Clare of Montefalco, 211; and fear, 213; and Gerson, 266, 277; of men, 204–5; Nider on, 218; and prophecy, 262; and scrupulosity, 216, 218; of women, 204–11, 213, 216. *See also* body; humors, theory of; medicine; pathology
Pierre Clergue. *See* Petrus Clericus of Montaillou
piety, 55, 101, 287, 301
pilgrimage, 63, 91, 152
*Pirotas, Bernardus, of Lodève (priest), 174, 176
Plato, 277
poena, meaning of, 83
Pompanazzi, Pietro (philosopher), 205
* **Porete, Marguerite, 77n, 172, 212, 268, 270, 281n, 302
pope: and Beguins, 177; and canonization, 128, 129–30, 131, 133, 134, 135, 138, 139, 142, 291n; Constance de Rabastens on the, 272; and Francis of Assisi, 168; and inquisition into heresy, 170; and inquisition into heresy vs. canonization, 142; and the inquisitor into sanctity, 130; and Joan of Arc, 256; and John of Pouilly, 9; and Lateran IV, 1; and Lutgard of Aywières, 56; and mendicants, 32, 170; and purgative probation, 108; and relics, 73; and saints, 2; and schism, 260, 267, 270, 271, 272; and Spiritual Franciscans, 177

prayer, 58, 80, 213
preachers, 32, 52
prescience. *See* prophecy/prediction
priest, 298; absolution of, 214; as doctor, 20; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 101; and the eucharist-confession link, 15; interrogation of the, 40; as judge, 14, 19; Mary of Oignies's devotion to the, 52; as mediator and representative, 114; moral integrity of the, 40; and Raymond of Peñafort, 27; seeing as God, 41–42. *See also* clergy
probability, 286–87
probare/probatio, 3, 18, 108, 109, 236. *See also* purgative probation; torture
probatio purgativa. *See* purgative probation
procurator, 127, 130, 131, 132, 136, 137, 138, 148, 154, 234
proof, 14–21; and the body, 5, 191, 192; in canonization, 181, 182; and the Christian faith, 262; and confession, 18, 26; the confessor and, 181; constitution of, 1–2; establishment of, 15; and female spirituality, 183–84, 298; and Francis of Assisi, 167, 168; of gold, 3, 80, 107, 108, 113, 115; and heresy, 51; and inquisition, 125; and Lateran IV, 17; and Magdalena Beutler, 200; of mystical gifts, 303; and purgative probation, 79–80; of rapture, 210–11; safety in, 297; of sainthood, 182–87, 188, 189–93; of spiritual discernment, 262–63; as a term, 3–4. *See also* accusation/denunciation; purgative probation
property, confiscation of, 122, 144n, 154, 159, 170
prophecy/prediction: and Christina Mirabilis, 57n, 76; by Elena d'Oglio, 145; of Elisabeth of Spalbeek, 189; by evil agents, 261–62; false, 267; Gerson on, 274–75; by Lutgard of Aywières, 216; of Magdalena Beutler, 197; of Mary of Oignies, 75; through mirrors, 253, and physiology, 262; by the Virgin Mary. *See also* revelations; visions
Pseudo-Albert the Great, *On the Secrets of Women*, 207
Pseudo-Apostles, 171n
Pseudo-Augustine, 23
purgative probation, 79–80, 107, 109–11, 113–15. *See also* proof
purgatory: and Beguines, 77; and Christina Mirabilis, 75, 76; criticism of, 77; and heresy, 58, 299; intercession in, 49, 57n, 58, 75, 78, 80, 299; and Lutgard, 57n; and Mary of Oignies, 62–63, 75, 80; purification in, 83; rejection of, 74; and Rixendis, 200; and suffering, 79; torture in, 82; visitors from, 82

quaestio, 234, 236, 239
queen, role of, 78, 272
quodlibetal questions, 37, 237, 238

Ralph of Coggeshall (Cistercian abbot and chronicler), 60
rapture, 70; of Clare of Montefalco, 211; and death, 70; demonic, 253, 254; and divine love, 210; of Elisabeth of Spalbeek, 202; fraudulent, 195n; and hysteria, 207–8; and illness, 210; of Magdalena Beutler, 197, 198; of Margaret of Ypres, 55; of Mary of Oignies, 64; and a melancholic complexion, 206–7; physiology of, 210–11; as proof, 262; proof of, 210–11; of Rixendis, 200–201, 202; of Sybil, 195, 196, 199; of the woman at Bourg-en-Bresse, 301; and women, 206
*Raymond VI (count of Toulouse), 143–44
*Raymond VII (count of Toulouse), 143–44
Raymond du Fauga (bishop of Toulouse), 60
Raymond of Capua (confessor to Catherine of Siena, master general of the Dominican order), 199
Raymond of Peñafort (papal penitentiary and Dominican canonist), 10n, 21–31, 32; canonization of, 28–29, 30; and confession, 21–31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 51, 217n, 221; and the *Decretals*, 22, 24, 29; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 5, 85, 90, 91, 101; and Gregory IX, 22; and heresy, 24–25, 26–27, 28, 35, 164; and inquisitional procedure, 121; on the inquisitor's pastoral role, 227–28; on perjury, 40–41; *Summa of Penance*, 22–23, 24, 27, 29, 92
reanimation, 75
*Recevutus (basterius) of Bologna, 170–71
rejuvenation, 70
relics: animated, 71–72; and Beguins, 175, 176, 177; of Elisabeth of Hungary, 72, 72n, 100, 141; of Guglielma, 153; and false, 141; and heresy, 72; Lateran Coun-

cil IV on, 73, 128; living women as, 70, 71–72, 73; and Lutgard of Aywières, 70, 71; and Mary of Oignies, 70, 71; papal sanction of, 73; skepticism about, 58; and Thomas of Cantimpré, 71–72, 175; traditional, 73. *See also* body
revelations, 208; of Bridget of Sweden, 256, 256n, 264–65; and canonization, 181; and confession, 48; of Dorothea of Montau, 148, 181; of Elisabeth of Hungary, 115; Gerson on, 268; of Margaret of Ypres, 55; of Vanna of Orvieto, 180, 199n. *See also* prophecy/prediction
Reyman, John (canonist and a confessor to Dorothea of Montau), 148
rhetoric, 234–35, 276. *See also* scholasticism
Richard of Saint Victor (theologian and prior), 256
Richer of Sens (chronicler), 116, 194, 196, 229
Rita (companion to Frances of Rome), 185
* **Rixendis of Narbonne, 200–203, 204
Robert of Courson (theologian and cardinal), 94n
*Robert le Bougre (Dominican inquisitor), 69, 173, 196, 229–30
*Rocha, Berengarius, of Clermont, 177
Roman inquisition (Sacred Congregation of Rome and of the Universal Inquisition), 30
Roman law, 18, 19
*Rosaflora (wife of Bonigrinus of Verona), 171, 172
roses, 63, 65, 68
*Rotlandus de Valle Brito of Montauban, 32

*Sabri, Bernardus, of Olargues (notary), 174, 235
sacraments: and Alan of Lille, 11n; and Conrad of Marburg, 115; and Elisabeth of Hungary, 100; and female spirituality, 48, 298; and heterodoxy, 297; and Lateran IV, 1, 11
*Saglimbene, Julianus (bursarius) of Bologna, 137n
saints: and Beguins, 174, 175; as a category, 4; and the centrality of their confessors, 58; coercive implications of the cults of, 166; and cross-dressing, 288n; cult of, 73; and the damned, 78; and death, 70; Francis of Assisi on, 181n; and Gerson, 285; in hell, 142; and heresy, 1, 59; and the inquest as hagiography, 188; and inquisition, 5, 105; intercession of, 58; living, 180, 181–93, 262, 290, 291; local inquiry into, 120; papal control of, 2; promotion of, 49; proof of, 3, 80, 107, 108; and purgative probation, 107; translation of, 120, 140, 153, 156. *See also* canonization; sanctity
Sala, Pierre (courtier and poet), 294n
Salimbene de Adam (Franciscan chronicler), 150–51n, 158, 158n
salvation, 40, 77, 80, 81
*Samarita, Andreas, of Milan, 153, 154, 155–56, 159, 160, 161, 162, 171n
sanctity, 210–11; assessment of, 116; and the body, 298; and canonization, 181; of Conrad of Marburg, 97; of Elisabeth of Hungary, 87n, 97, 102, 105; female, 144, 210–11; Gerson on, 289, 290; of Guglielma, 153; inquest into, 164; and inquisition, 3, 5, 127–37, 299; and Lateran IV, 1; and the living dead, 74–75; of Margaret of Ypres, 55; of Mary of Oignies, 64; official vs. popular, 166; and purgative probation, 80; representations of, 2; reputation for, 252–53; requirements for, 127. *See also* canonization; saints
Satan: and Elisabeth of Hungary, 110; and Job, 108–9; and Nider, 302; Peter d'Ailly on, 261; and possession, 253; pride of, 238; sophistical, 274; as trickster, 235. *See also* demon(s)/devil(s)
scholars, 238, 258, 259, 273
scholasticism, 37, 167, 168, 204, 233–37, 259, 264, 276–77, 282, 297; and inquisitional procedure, 5, 233–34, 235–37, 299
Schwester Katrei, 199
scrupulosity, 211–30, 300; of Beguines, 4–5, 51; and erroneous conscience, 241; and Gerson, 266; and inquisition, 220–26, 227–30; of Margaret of Ypres, 54; of Mary of Oignies, 51, 54; self-destructive, 299. *See also* conscience
secrecy. *See* confession, sacrament of
seduction, 32n, 103n, 194, 217, 229, 280, 292
self-mortification, 21, 51–52, 64, 82–83, 86, 87, 220n

senses, 208, 213, 241
sentence, 81, 123, 127, 139–40, 174. *See also* judgment
sexuality, 50, 207, 209, 251. *See also* love
*Sibilia (widow of Beltramus Malcozati of Milan), 160
*Sichi, Marchixius (Cistercian conversus?), 163, 164
sickness. *See* illness
Simon de Monteforte (earl of Leicester and military leader of the Albigensian Crusade), 63n
Simon Magus, 261
sin: and Beguines, 51; and Christina Mirabilis, 76; and confession, 14, 37; and conscience, 241–42; conviction of, 215; as crime, 43; culpability in, 241, 246; and the eucharist-confession link, 15; and *On the Good and the Evil Spirit*, 290; and inquisition into heresy, 140; of Joan of Arc, 290–91; and Lutgard of Aywières, 57; of Margaret of Ypres, 54; of Mary of Oignies, 51, 52, 54, 64; masculine, 83; mortal vs. venial, 51, 214, 215; nature of, 38; penance for, 81; recognition of, 212, 216, 218, 221–22, 226–27; remission of, 13; reserved, 227; and scrupulosity, 212, 214; and Thomas of Cantimpré, 57; unconfessed, 226–27. *See also* conscience; scrupulosity
somatic/somaticism. *See* body
sophist, 247
spiritual director, 93, 102n, 105, 113, 114, 115
spiritual discernment, 5–6, 204, 250–63, 282, 300; Gerson on, 264–66, 268, 269, 270, 275, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 289, 292, 293, 296, 300; and Nider, 294, 296
Spiritual Franciscans, 164–65, 173–74, 177. *See also* Beguins
Stephen V (pope), 16, 18
Stephen of Bourbon (Dominican inquisitor), 59, 62, 190n, 222
Stephen of Salagnac (Dominican historian), 30
stigmata: of Christine of Stommeln, 184; of Elisabeth of Spalbeek, 186–87, 188, 189; and Franciscans, 188; of Francis of Assisi, 166–69, 180, 189n, 205; of Guglielma, 155; of Lucia of Narni, 192, 194; and men vs. women, 204–5; and the mother-fetus relationship, 205; of Paul, 189n, 192; as proof, 262; as superior to martyrdom, 180
Strohm, Paul, 78
submission: of Elisabeth of Hungary, 89, 95–96; in John Cassian, 112–13. *See also* obedience
suffering: and Beguines, 298; and the body, 81; celebration of, 3; and Christina Mirabilis, 76; of Dorothea of Montau, 148; earthly, 79–80, 299; of Elisabeth of Hungary, 102, 109; and female spirituality, 70; and hell, 79; and heresy, 81; of Job, 108, 109; and martyrdom, 63; of Mary of Oignies, 80–81; proof of saints by, 3; and purgatory, 79; purification by, 83; as salvific, 81; spheres of, 79; and Thomas of Cantimpré, 81–82, 84; validation of, 79; value of, 3; vicarious, 74, 76
supernatural, naturalization of, 259, 264. *See also* angels; demon(s)/devil(s)
*Sybil of Metz (Beguine?), 194–97, 199, 202, 251, 252

testimony/deposition, 126, 135, 140. *See also* witness
theology, 204, 239, 264, 273, 287
Third Order Franciscans, 177
Thomas, Peter (Franciscan theologian), 167, 189n
*Thomas Boni of Foligno (Franciscan chaplain), 147–48
Thomas of Cantilupe (bishop), 129, 134, 137n, 181
Thomas of Cantimpré (Dominican theologian), 115; on Albert the Great, 238n; and the Cathar Perfect class, 74; and Christina Mirabilis, 53, 75–76; *Concerning Bees*, 33–34, 53, 66–70, 75, 78, 79, 81–83; and confession, 53–54, 57; on confessional experience, 54; and the confessor's importance to the saint, 58; on demons' deception, 250–51, 252–53; and the elevation of Lutgard, 183; and female spirituality, 70; and Gerson, 277n, 289; and Gregory IX, 71, 90; and heart disease, 208; and heresy, 65, 68, 70, 73, 74, 299; and hysteria, 208; and an incubus, 103n; and James of Vitry, 52, 56; and judgment, 77; and living saints, 181;

and Lutgard of Aywieres, 33, 36, 37, 183; and Margaret of Ypres, 53; and martyrdom, 65, 66–70, 83; and Mary of Oignies, 53, 75; and penance, 52; on a pseudo-saint in Antwerp, 152n; and purgative probation, 79–80; on purgatory, 58, 75; and relics, 71–72, 175; requires a judicial oath from a penitent, 103; and the sacrament of confession, 53–54; and the seal of confession, 33–34; spiritual mother of, 56; and spirituality, 33; and suffering, 81–82, 84; and temptation of confessors, 57
Thomas of Como (Dominican inquisitor), 162n
Thuringia, church of, 96
*Tors, Conrad (Dominican informant to Conrad of Marburg), 103
torture: of Andreas Samarita, 162; and Christina Mirabilis, 76, 81; and criminals, 82; and identification with Christ, 184; and inquisition into heresy, 3, 125, 126, 303; introduction of, 18; of the just, 166; and Nider, 302; as proof, 3; in purgatory, 82; and Raymond of Peñafort, 26; of Saglimbene, 137n; somatic substitution for, 68; terminology of, 18, 236; and torment, 21, 26; and trickery, 235; of woman at Bourg-en-Bresse, 301
translation, 140, 141, 153, 156
Trent, Council of (1545–63), 10, 15, 35
Trexler, Richard, 166n
tribunal, 11, 18, 26, 42, 43. *See also* inquisition, into heresy
Trithemius, John (Benedictine abbot and historian), 88n

Ugolino, Zanchoni (inquisitor), 221, 228, 303
Ullmann, Walter, 18n
university, 6, 37, 126, 233. *See also* scholasticism
University of Paris, 19, 288–89

**Vanna of Orvieto (nun, Third Order Dominicans), 180, 183, 199n
Vauchez, André, 49, 50, 62, 63, 134n, 189, 271n
Vincent of Beauvais (Dominican encyclopedist), 205, 208, 210
virginity, 63, 65, 87n, 93, 144, 145. *See also* chastity
Virgin Mary, 34; and Alpais of Sens, 190n; caution of the, 251; as deceived, 244; a demonic, 251; and Elena d'Oglio, 144; and Francis of Assisi, 167; intercessions of, 78; and Joan of Arc, 287; predicts diabolical visit, 251n; and Rixendis, 200
visions, 200, 204–5, 208, 219, 274; false, 243n, 251, 251n, 252, 254, 255n. *See also* prophecy/prediction; revelations
Vitae patrum, 111–12, 115

Waldensians, 9, 58, 171n
Wayman, Dorothy, 292–93
Wessley, Stephen, 162
William (Benedictine abbot of Saint-Trond and confessor to Elisabeth of Spaalbeck), 187
William of Auvergne (theologian, bishop of Paris): on academic speculation, 248; on confession, 20–21, 221; on demoniacs, 62, 69n, 198, 208–9, 253–54; and demonic rapture, 253; on heresy, 62, 69–70, 69n; influence of, 211n, 278n; on physiology, 206–7, 208–9, 210, 211n, 278n; on prophecy, 262
William of Newburgh (canon and chronicler), 60
William of Ockham (Franciscan theologian), 239. *See also* Ockhamites
William of Puylaurens (chaplain of Raymond VII of Toulouse and chronicler), 66
William of Rennes (Dominican theologian), 41n
witchcraft, 291
witness: and canonization, 131, 132, 134, 135, 181; to Clare of Montefalco, 147; to Dorothea of Montau, 148; and inquisition, 125; to Joan of Arc, 287; to Leonardus of Foligno, 168; martyr as. *See also* informant/surveillance; testimony/deposition
women: abuse of, 85; and Beguins, 177; and the body, 79, 144; and Cathars, 50; and the clergy, 48; and concupiscible power, 277; and confession, 84; and cross-dressing, 288n, 295; curiosity of, 269; and d'Ailly, 272; and deception, 270; demons as, 251, 252; exclusion of, 297; and fervor, 268; and Gerson, 216–17, 266–70, 273–79; and heresy, 50; husbands' prerogatives over, 92; as ideal

women (*cont.*)
penitents, 219–20; and inquisitional procedure, 121; intercessions of, 78; and irascible power, 277; as living Bibles, 193; as living dead, 74–75; menstruating, 218; and Nider, 217–19, 271n, 302; pain of, 79; physiology of, 204–11, 213, 216; as proof of orthodoxy, 2, 47–49, 55–56, 70, 74–75, 188; and rapture, 206; and the sacrament of confession, 48, 49, 219–20; sanctity of, 144; scrupulosity of, 216–18, 219–20, 227; and self-incrimination, 221–22; and spiritual discernment, 254–56, 260; and spirituality, 79; as subordinate, 48; and supernatural phenomena, 204–5; supplications of, 78. *See also* asceticism; female mystics; female spirituality
*Wyclif (theologian), John, 9

Zeger, Friar (Dominican confessor to Margaret of Ypres), 54–55, 93
Žižek, Slavoj, *The Sublime Object of Ideology*, 68n